DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 342	24	UD 011 582

AUTHOR	Janowitz, Gayle
TITLE	After-School Study Centers: Experimental Materials and Clinical Research. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Illinois Inst. of Tech., Chicago.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-5-0344
PUB DATE	Jun 68
CONTRACT	OEC-5-10114
NOTE	369p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*After School Tutoring, Case Studies (Education), Demonstration Programs, Depressed Areas (Geographic), Discriminatory Attitudes (Social), Educational Disadvantagement, Educational Facilities, Negro Students, Nonprofessional Personnel, Primary Grades, Professional Personnel, *Program Descriptions, *Program Evaluation, Race Relations, *Reading Improvement, Urban Schools, *Voluntary Agencies, Volunteers, Volunteer Training

ABSTRACT

This is the report of a three-year demonstration program designed to explore the potentials and limitations in the use of volunteers in inner-city education. Four centers in Chicago supplied sites for training and research. Program emphasis was on one to one tutoring at least once a week for predominantly black and poor primary school children no more than one and one-half years below grade level academically; academic groups were combined with leisure, some auxiliary services, and cultural activities. The research design compared academic achievement in reading before and after tutoring, as measured by the Gates Reading Tests. Participants and control groups were tested. Reactions of tutors and coordinators were gathered, as well as a community study to gather factors affecting organizational stability of centers. Among the findings, one of the major handicaps in the development of volunteer work was the lack of ability on the part of professionals to relate effectively to non-professionals and to help them develop effective skills. [This document is reproduced from the best available copy. Chapter X and appendixes 1-5, although listed in the table of contents, were missing from the original document.] (Author/DM)

u

4C9-48C

BR 5-0344
PA 24

UD

ED051342

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

5-0344

Final Report

Project No. G-027

Contract No. OE-5-10114

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

After-School Study Centers: Experimental Materials and Clinical Research

Gayle Janowitz

Illinois Institute of Technology

Chicago, Illinois

June, 1968

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

UD011582

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface p. iii

Summary p. 1

I History of the Project p. 8

II Case Histories of Study Centers p. 21

III Stability of Study Centers p. 102

IV Children of the Study Centers p. 133

V The Impact of Tutoring: Quantitative Measures p. 166

VI The Impact of Tutoring: Case Histories of Students p. 190

VII Volunteers and Organizational Climate p. 269

VIII Organizational Problems: Internal Management p. 294

IX Organizational Problems: Community Relations p. 347

X Conclusions and Implications

Appendices

1 Training Materials: After-School Study Centers: Volunteer Work in Reading, by Gayle Janowitz

2 Training Materials: A Summer Volunteer Education Program

3 Program Planning: After-School Study Centers: Program Planning for the War Against Poverty, by Gayle Janowitz

4 Proposed Guidelines: The Use of Volunteers in the Public Schools of Chicago

5 Field Report: Use of Volunteers for High School Counseling, by Ann Parelius

PREFACE

Ideas about volunteer work in education are developing rapidly. What is written can at best be considered an interim contribution to a very pressing need. In 1963, in a brief pamphlet entitled *After School Study Centers: Volunteer Work in Reading*, I wrote limited observations on the problems and potentialities for supplementary education. This document has supplied the basis of a variety of public and private efforts and for this demonstration project; a copy is therefore included in the appendix.

Because of the rapid development of volunteer work and tutoring in education, in 1965 the University of Chicago published my *Helping Hands: Volunteer Work in Education*, in order to help meet the need for material in this field. The year before under this grant from the U.S. Office of Education, I started an intensive study of a number of after school study centers in Chicago, which is described in this report.

Hundreds of volunteers and agency staff members made valuable contributions to the research aspects of the demonstration project. The volunteers, ranging from high school students to retired adults who gave educational help to children, and the elementary school children who volunteered to accept help, made the study centers possible.

I am most grateful to Miss Edith Daley, coordinator of North Park Study Center. I wish also to acknowledge important contributions by Mr. Pranab Chatterjee, Mrs. Robert Grossman, Mr. Timothy Leggett, Miss Delores Long, Miss Kathleen McCourt, Mrs. Ann Parelius, and Mr.

David Street. None of these is to be held responsible for any part of this report. Rather, they have played an important part in this effort to study the recruitment and training of volunteer workers with children.

SUMMARY

"After-School Study Centers: Experimental Materials and Clinical Research" was a three-year demonstration program designed to explore the potentials and limitations in the use of volunteers in inner city education. Under the direction of the principal investigator, four centers supplied sites for training and demonstration work, for research and for the preparation of materials. The first center was located in a store front on the Near North side of Chicago and operated by an independent community group in a highly disorganized slum area; the second center was operated by the YMCA in a racially changing area, the third was a college student project in the Woodlawn community and the fourth was operated in the Welles-Darrow housing project in conjunction with the Chicago Housing Authority. Cooperative arrangements were worked out with other particular volunteer projects in Chicago. During the period of the study, there were in Chicago over one hundred related projects operated outside of the public school system.

In the four demonstration sites, the program emphasis was on one to one tutoring at least once a week for primary school youngsters who were academically below grade level. In all of the centers, academic groups were combined with a variety of leisure-time activities, cultural enrichment programs including field trips, and in two of the centers, the youngsters were served snacks.

It was assumed that rather than instructional techniques or curriculum materials, the essential element for effective tutorial assistance would be grounded in rewarding and stable personal relations between tutors and youngsters, as

well as the general climate of the after school study center. Students were selected on the basis of self referral as well as referrals from public and parochial schools. The study centers sought to assist youngsters in medical problems, especially with eye glasses, and to serve as an information center for available community services.

The research design called for a comparison of academic achievement in reading before and after tutoring as measured by performance on the Gates Reading Tests . Almost all of the youngsters served by the four centers were Negroes; the majority were from very economically deprived backgrounds. For a control group, a comparative sample of youngsters from a nearby city without a volunteer program was utilized. Extensive documentation was collected by means of participant observation, notes on individual youngsters prepared by tutors, study center supervisors, and the principal investigator. The tutors and the study center coordinators completed a questionnaire on their experiences and perspective and their evaluation of the performance of their students. In addition, a special field survey was completed which was designed to investigate the organizational factors associated with the stability of after school study centers.

The selection of youngsters for tutoring was not found to be a major problem. Self referrals and referrals from schools were adequate if testing was done so that the criteria of youngsters who are more than two years behind in reading performance were excluded. Emotionally disturbed youngsters tended not to use these study centers. Moreover, it was found that in the public schools without tutorial assistance, students fell further and further behind in reading year by year.

The quantitative test score data, supported by the control groups, and buttressed by the case study findings, showed that the academic programs of the after school centers had a discernible impact. Reading progress of approximately one month in one month of tutoring once a week was the pattern in three different centers. As a result, it was possible to cut down the continuous process of retardation that takes place in the normal course of events in the public school system. In addition, the case for the effectiveness of volunteer work in after school study centers is strengthened on the basis of cost analysis, which shows the relatively low investments that are involved; from approxmately $25.00 to $40.00 per pupil per year. The data collected show some differences in the relative effectiveness of the different study centers. Moreover it was inferred that most of these youngsters, without prolonged and continuous tutorial assistance, would display increased retardation.

The special organizational survey, plus data based on direct observation, underline the obvious point that the commitment and skills of the coordinator of the individual after school study center is crucial in determining effectiveness. It was not so much specific training and experience in education that was essential for a study center coordinator, although such experience could be helpful. It was, in fact, an ability to perform limited administrative tasks, a strong commitment to the goals of the program and an ability to relate to volunteers and youngsters. Persons with experience in community organization were more effective. Moreover, the success of study centers rested on the organizational climate that the coordinator could create.

The original assumption that the effectiveness of study centers and volunteers did not depend on the question of specific educational materials was borne out. It was found that adequate materials exist and could be rapidly assembled. With some orientation and continuous supervision, it was possible to instruct volunteers in the essentials of tutoring. An overriding conclusion was that the effectiveness of the volunteer tutor rests in her belief in the potential of the youngster to learn. Occasionally, tutors would have too high hopes, but in general, their strenght rested in the fresh and unstereotyped approach they had to their youngsters.

It was found that selection of volunteers was not a problem. If recruitment was carefully managed through personal contacts and through voluntary associations, appropriate persons became involved. Some volunteers failed, but they quickly dropped out or were assigned to other tasks in the study centers.

The after school study centers of the demonstration project were voluntary associations organized outside of the public school system. Their independent organization permitted a high degree of flexibility and a basis for innovation. They served to mobilize both personnel and resources that would not have been produced if they were part of the public school system. Moreover, there is every reason to believe that their separate and decentralized organization made them attractive to youngsters and integrated them into the local community and neighborhood life. There is also every reason to believe that there is a permanent need for such independent and voluntarily organized programs.

However, the volunteer movement in education must, as it has in a variety of cities, relate itself to the public school system to the point of direct access of volunteers to the classroom. It appears that such a development must be tied to a system of decentralized administration where the individual principal has wide authority for the management of a volunteer program in his school.

The demand for volunteer tutors greatly exceeds the supply as currently organized; moreover, the findings of this study indicate that available volunteers are poorly distributed geographically. The communities that need them the most are the hardest pressed to obtain the necessary numbers. This project serves as a stimulus to help improve the organization of the supply of volunteers operating outside of the school system.

It is also abundantly clear that adult volunteers alone will not meet the pressing needs for tutors both in the school system and in after school study centers. It will be necessary to employ high school students from the community to do such work, and although our experience is fragmentary, such an approach seems feasible.

Volunteer groups in after-school study centers serve the additional function of relating inner city parents and their youngsters both to the local public schools and to other community resources. The experience of the project emphasizes the social isolation between the school system and individual families. The volunteers help to inform parents and children how to relate to the public school system. They serve as an informal channel of communication and a source of support for both the parents and their youngsters.

The centers worked primarily with children in grades three through six, who were six months to two years retarded in reading. It was assumed on the basis of previous experience, that these children would be the best candidates for help. Older children, and children more retarded, had been found to be less successful candidates. The experiences in the centers verified these criteria, although there were always a minority of children from the upper grades and from the group more than two years retarded who did well. In general, however, the centers gradually preferred to work with third and fourth graders whenever possible, and agreed that even a two-year retardation was generally too severe for once a week tutoring. They preferred to think of one and a half years retardation as the usual limit for their efforts. In general, the less retarded the child was to begin with, the more progress he made. A minority of children were less than six months retarded, or at grade level at two of the centers, and their progress was superior to the others. However, they were not included in the data presented on academic progress, because they were not in the category that the centers were concentrating on.

One of the most important handicaps in the development of volunteer work, on the basis of the experience of the project staff, is the lack of ability on the part of professionals to relate effectively to non-professionals and to help them develop effective skills. In the training of teachers and social workers, there has been and continues to be little emphasis on how to work with non-professionals. Some progress has been made but this has been mainly with middle class college-educated volunteers. They reported in conferring with the project staff that they are treated with much more respect than was the case in the past. Both teachers and social workers have progressively reduced their hostility toward non-professionals, especially if they are middle class and if the particular effort is dominated by a middle class staff. There is, of course, resistance from union organizations and in some areas, from clerical unions as well.

The central problem is in the attitudes and skills of professionals--both middle and lower class--in dealing with volunteers and nonprofessionals who are recruited from low income areas and who have limited educational backgrounds. Strong elements of professional prejudice are still at work and there is a general tendency to downgrade these human resources. There is concern with immediate performance, rather than an emphasis on upgrading such persons and helping them to develop more skills on the basis of either informal or formal training. Thus, greater concern with the training of both teachers and social workers in utilizing indigenous personnel is essential. In the final chapter of the report implications for teacher training are presented.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

"AFTER SCHOOL STUDY CENTERS: EXPERIMENTAL MATERIALS AND CLINICAL RESEARCH"

This document is the final report of the Office of Education research project G-027, entitled "After School Study Centers: Experimental Materials and Clinical Research," which was conducted by Mrs. Gayle Janowitz, principal investigator, during the period October 1, 1964 to June 30, 1968. In the course of this project, demonstration and research work was carried out in four after school study centers operated in the City of Chicago outside of the public school system. The direction of the effort was to probe the effectiveness and problems of volunteer work in education in the inner city. This chapter sets forth the history and the objectives of the project.

In the early 1960's it became evident that a massive transformation of education in the inner city was required if youngsters from poor communities were to be given an equal opportunity to participate in American society. Likewise, education practices had to be improved even in better communities in order to meet the needs of a changing technological society. The use of volunteer workers and the development of after school study centers, both inside and outside of the school, rapidly emerged as one form of educational innovation.

With the guidance of the principal investigator of the project, a study center had been developed in 1962 in the vicinity of the University of Chicago, in conjunction with the Hyde Park Neighborhood Club, a settlement house. This neighborhood was an area of racial integration and social experimentation in urban renewal and community development. The study center had opened in an empty store front which was due to be demolished as part of the urban renewal program, and it was projected that this study center would later be relocated in the Neighborhood Club's building which was to be expanded. By 1964, this study center had a branch library which served approximately five hundred children and its homework group had a clientele of sixty students daily; seventy students were being given individual or small group academic help. In all some fifty volunteers were involved, plus approximately twenty students from nearby junior colleges who were interested in work with children. The following year, a number of new study centers and tutoring projects developed, several in neighboring communities.

On the basis of this experience, in developing the first study center in the Chicago area, the research outline of this project was developed. In the initial prospectus the following specific objectives were stated:

1. study problems in organizing, supervising and staffing volunteer after-school study centers, including methods of recruiting students.
2. prepare special materials for the training of supervisory and voluntary workers for the after-school study centers.

3. study the problems of tutoring youngsters who are not making adequate progress in reading and arithmetic.
4. supply a clinical setting for college students who are preparing for teaching.
5. explore the potentialities and limitations of training volunteers for tutorial work.
6. evaluate the experiences and effectiveness of such centers.

In designing this project, three propositions dealing with teaching personnel, curriculum materials, instructional techniques, and finally with the link between reading skills and verbal skills were set forth. First, improvement in the academic performance of pupils from deprived backgrounds can be produced by supervised and rapidly trained volunteer personnel who offer stable and supportive assistance and who make use of academic instruction to develop self esteem. The academic and pedogogical techniques required for this kind of tutorial work are limited and can be readily taught, whereas the development of an effective orientation of these students requires continuing supervision especially by group discussion techniques.

The second proposition dealt with learning situation and curriculum, broadly defined; improvement in academic skills requires an educational setting and basic materials which will help to bring the pupil into the mainstream of American life and values without rejecting his own experiences. From a public policy point of view, it will not suffice to eliminate the present middle class curriculum and recreate a culturally ghettoized curriculum.

The third position, which dealt with the linkage between reading and verbal skills, was speculative in its theoretical basis but represented a critical aspect of the academic program of the study centers. It stated that the development of reading performance, which is judged as a central educational task of the school, requires the improvement and development of speech among these youngsters.

In the original research and demonstration proposal, the broad operational implications of these propositions were set forth and they supplied guidelines for the development of the demonstration program. The operational implication of the first proposition set as an objective that tutors commit themselves to a minimum of one semester. It was also essential that, although the tutors would be volunteers, they develop a professional acceptance of their role and each appointment be fulfilled in order to meet the expectation of the pupil. The development of stable supportive relations involves extensive reading with the child both to make up for the absence of such stimulation and as a demonstration of genuine interest in his well being. The whole approach involves an element of privacy between the tutor and the pupil even though the tutoring work goes on in a large study center. This element of privacy and personal support is the special contribution of the study center in contrast to the basic work of the classroom teacher.

The original proposal also set forth the notion that some system of recognition of basic needs of the pupil is essential although care needs to be exercised to avoid any feeling of bribery. Thus, when the tutoring session is over, food is offered to the pupil, both because he is hungry and as a reward.

In connection with this first proposition, it is necessary to probe out those specific techniques which are available to make instruction realistic and supportative of the child. For example, this involves the use of the child's name, respect for his integrity by offering help freely without demands on him for performances, and by not allowing him to flounder or fail, but trying to arrange for some small success in each lesson.

With respect to the second proposition, it was stated that standardized mass-produced materials would supply the core of the program's curriculum. Nevertheless, many materials would be produced by the study center staff to reflect individual needs and local environment. But it was also stated that there was no need to be excessively concerned with specific materials, since:

"We are dealing with the sheer necessity of putting material into the hands of these children. The study center gives a majority of its students the first books that they can take home and the first books that they have in their homes. Because it is not bound by arbitrary definitions, a great variety of materials can be used. These objects as personal objects become part of the process of integrating the pupil into the life of the study center. Moreover, the tastes are broad and reflect the interests of the children and not merely those of the authorities."

Finally, in connection with the third proposition the question was raised, "What does it mean to state that the development of reading skills requires an emphasis on language development?" From a genetic point of view, language is an essential component of personality development. From an educational point of view, command of language gives meaning to the reading process. (It is striking to report that tutors were literally overwhelmed when they recognized that some of these youngsters do not fully comprehend that the symbols in their reading books stand for real objects.) From a cultural point of view the pupils must learn to relate their own special soundings to those which the school teaches via textbooks. Nor should it be overlooked that reading is exploratory and that the attainment of verbal skills enhances the pupil's willingness to test himself in reading.

The organization and operation of the demonstration project was designed to probe these propositions and to evaluate the validity of their operational implications. The principal investigator was to work half-time on the project. A full-time project coordinator was to be responsible for the management of the various demonstration study centers, including recruitment of volunteer workers and liaison with the schools. There were to be three or four study centers each with a part-time paid supervisor, and it was also expected that the project coordinator would serve as a supervisor of one of these demonstration centers. In addition, each study center would have some paid assistants including students to help in the academic program and its various operations. The principal investigator was responsible for the training of the paid and the volunteer personnel.

The project coordinator was to function in part as a kind of community organizer. From the very start, it was evident that the community and group work aspects of the demonstration effort were the most troublesome and difficult to organize. The first person to be engaged for this task was a young lady with an undergraduate degree in journalism who had been active in college student efforts in tutoring and in developing a neighborhood study center. It was hoped that personnel with such background could rapidly develop the necessary leadership for such a post and in the initial phases of cooperating with established centers and in setting up one new homework center in the inner city, her work was very satisfactory. But problems arose in the second year because of the groups developed among both staff and children, and the deteriorating neighborhood of one center. Although very effective with both individual staff and children, she was unable to develop the skills necessary to work with the groups who were in conflict.

It was decided to hire a professional social worker with community organization and group work background. His role was crucial in working with the groups developed at the center--whether these groups were volunteers who wanted more or less structure to the program, or delinquent groups of boys who disrupted the work of the center. At the time he joined the staff, a former teacher had been hired to run one of the centers, and the involvement of persons with experience in both social work and education was satisfactory.

The role of the second "project coordinator" was defined as that of a research assistant in the collection and analysis of data. He was successful in the limited role of running the actual centers, but was limited by his ability as a community organizer and group worker. Whereas the first coordinator had put too much responsibility on the shoulders of non-professionals, the new coordinator was unable to allow non-professionals to do enough meaningful work to learn their jobs.

It was necessary to redefine the jobs of the professionals--a social worker and a teacher--as research assistants. The failure of either project coordinator to develop all of the skills necessary to train non-professionals actually turned out to be a source of strength, since the centers developed more of a grass roots character when non-professionals were put in charge. In retrospect, the very notion of project coordinators seems to have been unnecessary. It was an uncritical acceptance of contemporary community practice and a response to pressure to develop a demonstration project that would conform to conventional standards and therefore be more acceptable for government funding.

In October, 1964, the demonstration phases of the project were launched. The Hyde Park Neighborhood Club, where the principal investigator developed the basic concepts in the preproject phase, proved impossible as an effective demonstration site. The director of the club had over-expanded his program and saw in the federal grant a source of funds to support his operations. He refused to permit the necessary conditions for effective development of experimentation and research. Board members of the organization were most supportive of the project, but felt unable to intervene. By this time, however, a variety of successful centers had developed, and it was quite clear that such programs could do well in middle-class and suburban communities. The much more important question was whether such efforts could succeed in more difficult, inner-city, or transitional neighborhoods.

Between the time that the proposal for this study was submitted and accepted, the development of academic centers outside of the schools of Chicago had proceeded very rapidly. The centers chosen to cooperate with the staff and developed by them were selected to represent a range of organizational types. Since Chicago was the last major city to accept volunteers in the schools, nearly one hundred projects of various kinds of academic help developed outside of the schools between 1962 and 1964. Most successful were those in the middle-class communities and in the suburbs.

Many of the new centers tried to follow the pattern of the original storefront center near the University of Chicago in which the principal investigator had been involved. A very large number of them consulted with the staff and were encouraged to develop projects in terms of their own community needs and resources. (One main impression of the centers in Chicago has always been their diversity.)

During the first year of the project, the staff began to cooperate with two centers which continued to work closely with the project for more than three years. One was the North Park Study Center, which was and remained for three years the only center in Chicago run by an independent citizen board. This center is in a poverty area, but is only three and four blocks from middle-class communities from which the volunteers come. The other was the South Shore YMCA, in a middle-class transitional neighborhood, a center developed by a temple group and affiliated with a YMCA, and in the second year, assumed as a YMCA facility.

A homework center was also developed in a poverty area, and moved after a semester into a housing project. This center was sponsored by a local parents' council, in cooperation with the project.

Three other programs were selected during the first year which were located in poverty areas and which had the elements of stability that seemed necessary for success. These included paid staff, professional supervision, a mixed corps of volunteers, and minimum financial backing from a sponsoring agency. Two of these wished to cooperate with the project, but came under another funded federal program. The remaining one, Erie House, cooperated in testing, but was closed suddenly within four months when the staff supervisor left the agency.

Only in the North Park center and in the housing project center were staff paid by the research project. The YMCA tutoring project had adequate staff provided by the agency, as did the other center which closed within four months.

The fact that there was a high death rate among the projects in Chicago was obvious from the beginning, and the elements necessary for successful development were identified in a city-wide sample survey done in cooperation with the Center for Social Organization Studies of the University of Chicago. During the project, four college students from two different colleges were involved in the study of various phases of the development of study centers (working on three Master's papers and two Ph.D. dissertations). In addition, the project director served on the executive committee of the New Resident's Committee of Chicago, which served as a coordinating agency for all academic volunteer efforts outside of school. At the request of the Mayor's Committee on New Residents, a special survey was conducted to help plan future developments in Chicago. One new development has been increased participation by the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago.

During the second year, the project cooperated for several months with a project run by college students. Most volunteer work in the inner-city in Chicago, as in other cities, was done by college students who were bused in. A number of these centers were funded under large federal projects. The centers cooperating with the project which had a mixed corps of volunteers felt that college students were not as reliable as volunteers as either housewives or high school students. Two college programs available in the city were eager to cooperate with the project, but one was obviously not academically oriented, and served a captive audience of agency members. (The only children included in this program were members of the agency sponsoring in program, and the agency did not wish to serve other children.) In an adjoining poverty area, University of Chicago students had developed a project which appeared to be stable, and which was available to children who needed help and who were referred by the schools. The student coordinator of this project, who had served as a volunteer for more than a year, was hired by the project staff for five months to help record the experiences of this center. The program turned out to have limited stability because of the complete reliance on college students as volunteers and the unavoidable dissolution of the project each academic quarter.

During the remainder of the demonstration project, testing was conducted in six other projects which did not have qualified staff to do the testing. Several represent new developments in inter-agency cooperation, such as the use of urban progress centers and public libraries, and an increased supervised participation of high school students and college students who are training to be teachers.

A variety of research approaches were used in the research effort. First, strong emphasis was placed on participant observation of the history and activities of the various study centers. Second, tutors and staff personnel were encouraged to prepare anecdotal materials on each youngster so as to develop case histories. Third, reading achievement tests were administered in order to measure the relative progress of the students who were being tutored. Special care was taken to collect data on a comparable control group from two lower-class predominately Negro schools in a medium-sized city in Illinois, where no supplementary educational help was received.

The fourth approach was to undertake interviews and questionnaires with the staff personnel and volunteers of the study centers in order to obtain data on their background, mode of recruitment and their orientation and expectations. The firth approach involved two different organizational surveys of the structure and functioning of selected samples of after school study centers in Chicago. Both of these last two steps were assisted by the Center for Social Organization Studies, University of Chicago, which supplied technical direction and research assistants.

In the course of the development of the project, it was possible to prepare a variety of training materials for use by the volunteers. First, a pamphlet entitled *After School Study Centers* was written in 1964 by the principle investigator and distributed by the Mayor's Committee on New Residents. Second, a book-length manual entitled *Helping Hands* was published by the University of Chicago in

1965 in hardcover and paperback editions. This volume was reprinted twice by 1967, and was translated into Spanish and German.

In connection with these efforts, guideline materials were prepared for the Community Action Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity on the mechanics of developing and administering after school study centers. The project participated in five city-wide training conferences and seminars on the role of volunteers in public education.

During the four years of the project, the project staff consulted with approximately fifty individuals and groups involved in tutoring projects. These included projects in Benton Harbor, Michigan, South Bend, Indiana, Rockford, Illinois, and five suburban areas.

CHAPTER II

CASE HISTORIES OF STUDY CENTERS

This chapter sets forth reports on the historical development of the sites used in the demonstration and evaluation effort on volunteer work in education; North Park, the store front endeavor on the Near North Side of Chicago; South Shore, a YMCA-based project in a rapidly racially changing area; STEP (Student Tutoring Elementary Project), a University of Chicago student group which worked in the Woodlawn community; and Welles-Darrow, a center in a public housing project. In addition, there is a report on McKinley House, in which a homework center was developed, which moved after a semester to Welles-Darrow.

History of North Park Study Center

A young woman, who had been involved in the Northwestern University tutoring movement in 1962 and 1963, and was graduated in 1963, accepted a job as executive director of the Illinois Governor's Committee on Literacy and Learning. Her job was to help set up tutoring projects throughout the state, primarily in college communities. In the spring of 1964 she decided to start one in the Near North Side, the neighborhood where she lived. It is an area close to the entertainment and nightclub district of Chicago. She hoped to open a center along the lines of the first study center that had been opened in the Hyde Park community. She enlisted a group of five friends, including two young men. Five members of this group were white, and one was Negro.

This group contacted the director of a neighborhood boy's club, a community agency with several branches in the area. The director was interested in the idea and assured his cooperation. He at first asked them to meet with him at the main office of the club, about two miles from the neighborhood, but after they explained to him that they wanted a closer facility, he drove with them to a small branch building in the area where they lived.

This branch center had one large room and a small office. The building was available in the evenings. Located in a low income area which was predominantly Negro, but within a few blocks of middle-class housing in which the volunteers lived, it was only one-half block from a public school.

They were able to open their program at the beginning of the summer of 1964, and used the facility three evenings a week. The group did not immediately contact the school but decided to recruit volunteers through posters in the neighborhood and work with the children already registered in the recreation program. Approximately 30 volunteers worked that summer with 50 children, with many of the volunteers seeing two children individually. They had no paid staff and several of the young women assumed the job of informal coordination of the group each evening.

By the end of the summer, the group was convinced that the project could work but they could no longer be housed by the field house, since recreation groups would have to move indoors. They formed a board of directors, elected officers and took moves to incorporate themselves as a not-for-profit organization. A young woman who had become an informal leader, a clerk for an insurance company, was elected as chairman and a young male accountant as vice-chairman. A Negro employee of the telephone company was elected treasurer and a young woman who worked as a secretary volunteered to be secretary. The treasurer was the only Negro member of this group. The group of volunteers were predominantly single or divorced people under 30 years of age.

After much searching in the area, the group found an unused storefront in a large building complex. The building complex had originally been designed for an upper-middle class population and remained all-white as the neighborhood around it became all Negro. At the time the group began negotiating for the storefront in this building, it had become integrated with Negro middle-class families moving in.

This storefront was rented in September for $60 a month by the volunteer group. The management was later to claim it had rented the store front at a subsidized price, but several other storefronts remained empty in this building for a long time. The space consisted of one large room, approximately 30 feet by 25 feet, with a small lavatory and office behind. It had been vacated for several months and was extremely dirty.

The group had by this time been assured of a continuing donation by a local resident of $25 a month, a $600 grant from the

Governor's Committee on Literacy and Learning, and a $200 grant from the local Kiwanis Club. The group spent four weeks cleaning and painting the storefront. They were assisted by volunteers from the American Friends Service Committee in the painting job. Approximately 400 man hours were spent in remodeling the storefront. When volunteers came to work at the center every Saturday and Sunday and sometimes on weekday evenings, neighborhood children from the street came in and worked with them.

The owner of a night club and bar directly across from the center offered small tables, chairs, shelves, and a desk from his storeroom. These were cleaned and painted by the adult volunteers and children. As soon as the neighborhood found out what was going on, donations of books, paper and pencils began to appear. It was quite usual when the group was working to have someone walk by and leave books or magazines.

This study center opened on November 2, 1964. They planned to be open four evenings a week, Monday through Thursday, 6:30 to 8:30. All of the volunteers were young working adults and college students. Despite the experience of other centers being overwhelmed with children, the young adults had spread the word through the neighborhood and with the children who helped them so successfully that on opening night, 150 children came to register. Record cards and forms were ready and the group had decided to charge 25 cents a year for the service. This was the pattern in another center opened in a storefront and was encouraged by social workers in the group, because "the children should not think they get something for nothing." Actually, the problem of collecting the fee became time consuming and the group soon abandoned this idea. Children were assigned as quickly as possible on a first-come, first-served basis and 70 volunteers had been recruited. It was planned that each volunteer would see two children an evening for an hour each. From the very beginning it was obvious that the children had trouble arriving on time and this resulted in a very large number of children present in the available space and great confusion.

The volunteer group had prepared elaborate forms for the prospective volunteers. Despite the availability of only one room, they had asked the volunteers whether they preferred to work with pre-schoolers, elementary school children or high school children. They had also suggested newspaper clubs and had asked for suggestions of other types of clubs that volunteers might wish to run. It was obvious when the center opened that the tutoring program would have to be developed first and that this would actually take all of their time. Fortunately, no high school students came and very few pre-schoolers. Most of the children, about three-quarters, were from the nearest elementary school and they came by families.

It was hard for the children to accept the fact that they would have only one appointment per week. Most of them wanted to come everyday; on the first evening a mother of 16 children near the center sent a note explaining that her children had no place to do their homework and could they please come every night. The children were told they could come every night and do their homework in the smaller room in the back, but they actually had no interest in this and wanted an adult to themselves if they did come. One child who had been very active in helping to set up the center came almost every evening and attached himself to any volunteer who was free. At the end of the first two weeks, it was discovered that he had a tutor four evenings a week and three people thought he was assigned to them.

After the first four weeks of runing the center with volunteers, the staff were most anxious to have paid help. The project staff met with the board and agreed to cooperate with the center. The new project coordinator assumed the coordination of this center but for the first several weeks, the chairman of the volunteer board also spent nearly every evening at the center. During the work parties and the first few weeks of operation, volunteers occasionally provided refreshments for the children and staff. After three months of operation, they decided to formalize these arrangements, and take turns providing cookies. Each month at a tutor's meeting, the volunteers sign up. Often, the children are invited to the volunteer's apartment to help bake them, or to shop with the volunteer. The two students of the volunteers who provide refreshments serve as hosts or hostesses. This is a role prized by the children, often mentioned in volunteer reports as the "reason we had such a good lesson tonight."

More than three-fourths of the original group of thirty volunteers from the summer program continued in the fall. This group was expanded to seventy before the storefront opened. However, approximately twenty of the new volunteers were recruited through businesses and mass appeals. These twenty were, by and large, not stable volunteers. The original friendship group, plus the volunteers newly recruited by them became the stable volunteer force of fifty in the center, during the first six months. Despite various recruiting efforts during the next three years, the volunteers who remained with the center were almost entirely those recruited through personal ties. The friendship group broadened and changed, since new volunteers in turn brought in their friends, but the pattern was definite and even the number of volunteers remained amazingly constant. Six months after the center opened, there were fifty stable volunteers; each year after for three years, there were approximately fifty stable volunteers. The percentage of these who continued from one semester to the next was the highest among the centers studied, never falling below sixty per cent and ranging up to eighty per cent. The fact that the program continued through the summer months accounted for much of the stability. Other programs closed and found it necessary to recruit more new volunteers each fall.

The relationship with the original sponsor, the Boys Club, remained ambiguous for a long time. They had not wished for their name to be used since they felt unsure that the center would work out. The sponsoring group, therefore, selected the name "North Park Study Center" since they had started at a north park outpost of the larger club. Shortly after the center opened, when the Boys Club had no relationship to them, the study center board found that their mail was delivered to the head office of the agency and that a staff person of that agency had been assigned to their board without their knowledge. Staff people from the agency also appeared unexpectedly at the center and on one occasion tried to take charge, to the anger of the volunteer board. The independent board of the center asked for a meeting and defined the relationship as affiliation only. After that they had no more contact with the Boys Club until approximately one year later. The hostility of members of the board was understandable. As the chairman said, "they didn't think we could do it. Now that we've hatched, they want to play mother hen."

The bar across the street gave a hootenany the first year for the benefit of the center and raised $360. The next year, the same operation raised $600 and the third year, they raised $1,500. Jazz musicians gave their services free of charge, and the bar gave all of its profits for the evening to the group. Volunteers from the center worked as waitresses and waiters in the bar that evening.

In December, 1964, the project hired a local resident from the building complex as coordinator-in-training. She was a Negro woman in her 30's who had been trained as a beautician and had two years of college. From the beginning there were very few Negro volunteers (never more than three at a time) in the center. This woman was particularly interested in recruiting from the building complex in which the center was located. The building was at this time integrated and quite middle-class. She arranged several coffee hours and generated a great deal of interest but recruited no new volunteers. She also worked with Negro newspapers in publicity but again without results. She had been in complete agreement with the goals of the center but seemed gradually unable to really accept them. She also felt extremely defeated by her efforts to recruit volunteers. She gradually became more concerned about quiet and order and when the children did not have anything to do, she would suggest that they make quiet signs and post them in the center. She asked that music be piped in. It gradually became obvious that she was orienting the tutors herself, feeling that she knew more about working with Negro children. She did not give them the instructional and orientation materials that were prepared.

She had visited the center several times and knew that the volunteers were called by their given names but after she had worked there for some time, she expressed misgivings about this. She said that some mothers were concerned about it and it turned out to be only one mother who complained. The coordinator-in-training did not know that the staff was aware that this woman was, in fact, her sister. It was almost as though her own failure caused her to become critical of both the volunteers and the children. No one had expected her to do the impossible in recruiting volunteers, but she had felt that this was going to be her contribution and she had talked a great deal about what she was going to do. She became more critical of the children's appearance and put pressure on them to be quiet and behave nicely. She also began to tell the staff that they should listen to Negro radio stations and attend Negro churches to be able to "understand" these children.

Originally the children had liked the coordinator-in-training very much but gradually this changed and there seemed to be just too much tension between the staff and children and her. If she had not felt so defeated in her efforts to build up the representation of Negroes in the center, she probably would not have reacted with such apparent hostility. Obviously the volunteers were still recruiting new volunteers, and she was unable to.

Soon after her position was terminated after three months, another coordinator-in-training was hired. She was a young Negro woman with two years of college. She came recommended by several teachers in the community. She was an extremely intelligent girl and the children liked her very much. She was an art student and the children respected her obvious ability in that area. Whatever she did with the children was extremely good, but after the first week it became obvious that she had trouble getting to work on time. The project coordinator opened the center and the coordinator-in-training arrived nearly an hour late day after day. Various efforts were made to help her in getting her car repaired and in telling her to take cabs when necessary but after many excuses, this pattern continued for nearly two months. The children had been extremely fond of her in the beginning and she obviously had ability to work with them. However, they became more outspoken and critical of her than were the staff because they would watch for her each day and realized she came very late. They would be overheard agreeing with each other "you just can't count on her." The parents also came by a couple of times to see if the center was actually opened on time and if the coordinator-in-training was there, because they had heard about her lateness. This was interesting because it was the only time the parents did come by because of any general concern of the center. Other times they always came because of specific interest in a child. However, the parents did seem aware of the problem because of the children's conversation at home. Despite her insistence that the problem could be solved and she would be on time it was obvious that she never could be.

After her job was terminated, she came to talk to the project staff to ask for another job in another study center. It turned out that she had bought things on credit assuming she would be able to make the payments and now she was unable to do so. After she left the center, she was known to have two other jobs both of which were terminated within two weeks because of the same problem of being consistently late. Actually, if the problem had been one of being a few minutes late, the staff would have tried to work with her over a longer period of time, but her pattern was one of being consistently late up to an hour a day. Since she was paid on an hourly basis, she was always quite shocked at the results of her attendance record, wanting to deny to herself the full extent of her pattern of missing work.

It was during the two months that this coordinator was present that the project coordinator decided to open the center for homework in the afternoons. The schools were not notified because it was decided to do it on a trial basis for three months. Many of the children apparently made up homework in order to be able to come. Many did not have meaningful homework so that it required the use of games and activities. A group of six women came in three afternoons a week for three months. Then they decided the neighborhood was becoming more dangerous and they were afraid to come in in the daytime. The neighborhood was continually changing and the building complex was becoming less middle class month by month. It was decided that there were no other sources of afternoon volunteers available and so the homework program was discontinued. Although the school had not been informed about it, several teachers sent word that they very much regretted its closing because they had felt it had successfully motivated the children to do their homework. The staff had felt that not enough children had homework of the type that they really need help with to make the effort worth while. After this one attempt to use the center during the afternoons, no other efforts were made to open it regularly at other hours. The storefront was used only during the two hours, four evenings a week, when the tutoring program was conducted.

After two local coordinators-in-training had proved unsatisfactory, the project coordinator continued to operate the center herself. She had been involved in the center from the earliest beginnings in the former field house. Despite the unsuccessful search for a coordinator-in-training, she provided crucial continuity to the effort. While the plan of the research had provided that she should continue to run one center, the project staff felt that it was important that a local resident be found and trained, in terms of long-term stability for the center.

In September, 1965, a white college student was hired as coordinator-in-training. Despite her youth, eighteen years of age, and her limited background in work with children which included work in summer camps and tutoring, she had deep professional interest in work with children. She planned to become a social worker, and viewed the job as professional training. She was successful, and after a year of the project coordinator's almost continual involvement in the center, she was put in sole charge of the center, supervised by outside conferences with the principal investigator. (The project coordinator left during this time, and was replaced by a social worker, who supervised the coordinator-in-training until she assumed full responsibility for the center.)

In December, 1965, the board officially changed the policy of having volunteers see two children each evening. The volunteers wished to see one child for a longer period of time. Several were already doing so, because all children originally assigned did not come regularly. As one of a volunteer's students dropped out, she began to work all evening with the one remaining. New volunteers had been assigned only one student during the first few weeks, and another later. But the volunteers felt that they could do a better job with one student. It was possible to shift easily to this arrangement, by not accepting new referrals. A number of volunteers continued to work with two children until some were reassigned. The changeover took two months to accomplish.

One main achievement of this young coordinator was her ability to accept student helpers and work with them effectively. The project had provided for such assistance, but both of her supervisors had found many objections to the use of paid student help. The first one felt that so many children were eager to help that it would be necessary to continually rotate the jobs; this turned out not to be true. The other, a professional social worker, was much too concerned with the professional requirements of such a center. While the first coordinator put too much responsibility on the young coordinator of the center, the second professional was reluctant to allow her enough freedom of action to learn the job. It was not until she was actually put in charge that she emerged as a very effective coordinator, with unusual respect for the work of volunteers and impressive ability to guide the work of young helpers.

One of the major stumbling blocks in the development of volunteer work is the basic inability of either teachers or social workers to respect non-professionals enough to allow them to handle difficult situations and learn from them. The same applies to volunteers, and there is little in the experience of professionals to guide them in accepting volunteers. Certain functions--contact with families and with difficult children--are assumed by them to require professional intervention. Even if a non-professional coordinator or volunteer may not handle a difficult problem with the same expertise, there are times when their involvement is more important. Instead of gradually withdrawing from the center, professionals can become so involved that they define certain functions as "professional" and others as worthy of non-professionals. This defeats the entire project, because non-professionals can and often do have basically good common sense and flexibility which can help them to acquire the assurance and skills necessary. But they cannot do this if assigned only marginal, carefully circumscribed, roles.

Non-professionals have the skills needed to work with these children. Professionals can be enormously helpful, if they have the humility to respect the good qualities of others without their training. The center had many of these. Ironically, however, at this center, a few "professionals" made mistakes which did not occur with non-professionals. Apparently, a little knowledge can sometimes incapacitate one in working with children. Volunteers often presented "case summaries" of their children to the staff. It was an experienced teacher who asked her student about the education of the boy's parents, because this would "interest the staff." The volunteer teacher reported that the child told her that his father had "two years of college," and his mother had about "six weeks of college." She felt that the boy had not told her the truth, but did not seem to realize that she had no business asking such a question. The student coordinator, who lived in the neighborhood, knew the family well and had been told by the parents that they had not finished high school, which was one reason for their concern about their children. The other volunteers considered the teacher's request an invasion of privacy, but did not say so out of respect for her age. It would not have occurred to them to ask such a question.

Another example of the same incapacity of professionals involved a social worker. His attitude at the center caused some volunteers to question why he left his professional skills outside the door and seemed to consider the center a place to express his independence. He sometimes expressed platitudes of professional opinion, which seemed inappropriate to other volunteers. Most criticized by the other volunteers was the time he came for a bus trip with his student and, at the last moment, walked off with the boy to travel in his own sports car. The entire staff of volunteers and their students were travelling by bus, but he drove. While his errors had little to do with genuine professional skills, there was a feeling that he assumed prerogatives because of his known professional training--prerogatives that were never assumed by others. There were so many instances of similar mistakes by professionals that the record of this center showed clearly that "when real blunders occurred, they were the result of misguided professionals." The difference was not only that such errors would not have occurred to non-professionals; even more important was their personal conviction that they often did not know what to do, and asked. Errors of non-professionals are more often acts of omission, because they wait for advice. This is only slowly overcome by meaningful encouragement and support.

Starting in January, 1965, this study center had a retired school teacher who worked as a volunteer two evenings a week. After the afternoon program was abandoned, he began to come to the center on his own. His job of helping a friend in an ice cream parlor whenever needed meant that he could often leave at 4 or 4:30, three afternoons a week. He had a key and came alone to the center. There were always boys from the study center in the street and as soon as they saw him come, they would come in to work with him.

This operation was unique in our experience. We have never seen any other center where this kind of "Guerilla" operation took place. This older white-haired white gentleman had taught school in Chicago for many years. He had a quiet manner and was very accepting of the children. In the years that the center operated in this neighborhood he was the only person, professional or non-professional, who never had any behavior problems with the children. The group of boys, ten to thirteen years old, numbered from eight to eleven, and included a number of difficult "tough" boys. The same boys who would come in and work with him were most reluctant or unwilling to read aloud in the storefromt in the evenings when they might be overheard by other children. They would select very simple books and read them with this man in front of their friends, books which they would never look at in the evening when other children were there. If they were doing something special in school and needed extra material, he would help them find it even if it meant going to a library the next day. He took the group on several outings around the city on his free time during the weekends. The next summer he worked in the regular summer hours only one night a week and was not able to give any afternoon time to the center. That fall, he went to Montana where he could still teach. The following summer, he returned and again gave one evening a week and sometimes extra evenings to the center. The boys at the center were probably more attached to him than to any other volunteer. He sent cards to a number of them during time he was away, and the children often mentioned him.

This center always remained open throughout the year because of the volunteer staff. Most of them had a two week vacation during the summer but otherwise wanted to continue. It is the only center in the city that the staff knows about that remained run by an independent board and worked on a year-round basis. The summer program remained the same tutoring program as during the winter but since the children did not have homework, there were many more activities and games added.

In July, 1965, the Boys Club had asked for another meeting with the study center to come to some decision about their relationship. At this meeting it was decided that they would wait until fall, 1966, when they hoped to be able to assume paying for some staff salaries at the study center. In the meantime, the Boys Club would pay the study center's rent starting in August, 1965.

During the first year of operation in the storefront center, less than a third of the children attending were white. A year later, there were only two white children still attending. Six months later, the last white child left when her volunteer began to see her at home, instead of in the center. The volunteer had always escorted the child to and from the center, but comments made to the child on the street upset both child and volunteer. Unpleasant comments to adults were so infrequent that the staff was unaware of any volunteer leaving for this reason.

The children who attended this center most regularly came from thirty Negro families in the immediate area. These families had an average of six children each, considerably above the average family size in the housing project. Six of the families had no telephone. Only two of the families moved out of the neighborhood during the three years that the research project was involved with the center.

In the fall of 1967, arrangements were completed for the North Park Study Center to affiliate more closely with the Boys Club. In the fall of 1966, the Boy's Club had continued to pay the rent but had made no attempt to redefine their role. During 1966-1967, the Boy's Club was incorporated with a large combine of agencies, and the Study Center board had to wait for new directors to decide on the basis of affiliation. By fall of 1967, arrangements were completed and a social worker from the agency assumed supervision of the study center. The agency hired the coordinator who had been employed by the research project staff for two years. For the last year, she had assumed major responsibility for the operation of the center, but with professional guidance from the project coordinator and the project director. The agency never contacted the research project staff, despite their involvement in the center for three years.

The neighborhood of the study center had become very tense during the previous summer. Several times, rumors had spread through the community about imminent demolition of much of the area, and of racial disturbances. A restaurant opened next door to the study center, attracting crowds of young adults. The streets were full of people every evening, but no longer only the children who lived there. Large groups of young adult men from neighborhood areas began to hang around the street in front of the center. The coordinator checked with city officials and the police about some rumors, and encouraged the staff to report such rumors, and to assure the children that these were only rumors. When one particularly persistent rumor of trouble was reported, the coordinator talked to the local police and decided, on the basis of the verification that this rumor was particularly wide-spread, to close the center for one week. This was done, with some misgivings that the volunteer staff might not return. The opposite effect was noted. There was no trouble in the area, the volunteers all returned, and expressed satisfaction with the arrangement which had been explained as merely cautionary.

In addition to the coordinator, the agency assuming supervision of the center also hired a male Negro work-study junior college student to be at the center in the evening. He was most helpful in keeping the center clean, in escorting volunteers to their cars or to the elevated, and in intervening in difficulties between the children. He was extremely calm and could quietly separate troublesome children and talk quietly with them, so that the volunteers were unaware that any trouble had begun. The coordinator thought his quiet, gentle manner with the children was most helpful. When he substituted for volunteers, however, he wrote reports on the children which were more like the reports they wrote on each other. They were punitive, and he tended to be extremely critical of the children individually. But in the role of general helper, he was most successful, according to both the coordinator and the volunteers.

The center had always been furnished with donated small ice cream tables and chairs, but some of the tabletops were rough, and these were periodically covered with contact paper. The first act of the new social work supervisor was to buy new small classroom desks and several metal tables. The desks were too small for most of the children who attended, and for all of the volunteers, and were pushed against the wall, unused except for an occasional small child who came to work on homework. The metal tables were rather large. Since the whole program involved individual tutoring at which volunteers sat at separate tables with their students, card tables would have been much more usable, although none of the staff felt that the original ice cream parlor tables were inadequate. Card tables should have been considered, since the staff had meetings quite often and occasional parties for the children, and space was a problem.

The agency supervising the center expressed no interest in evaluation, and had no plans for either reporting by the volunteers nor for testing of the children. The board asked the research project to continue testing, and volunteers asked for report forms so that they could continue their previous reporting.

From the beginning, the coordinator found the paperwork required by a social agency to be more time-consuming than the reporting formerly required by the project staff. This appears to not be true, in terms of the amounts of reports, but rather, in the kind. Reporting about the activities of children and volunteers seemed rewarding to her, since she hopes to enter social work graduate school. But the reporting now required consisted almost entirely of estimates of how she spent her time on the job, and the forms, she felt, were more suitable for group recreation programs, and hard to complete in terms of the study center job.

Meetings with the project staff were always held outside of study center hours, but the coordinator was now required to attend meetings during the hours when the center was open. This left the work-study student in charge. By the second semester, two additional work-study students were assigned to the center every evening. At the same time, the coordinator began to attend more meetings. Instead of an average of one every two weeks, she was now required to attend one early evening meeting each week, and three a week one week of every month. This meant that her time on the job was considerably decreased and the supervision of the center left to inexperienced work-study students.

Although the project staff continued contacts with the study center board and the volunteers to help with testing and reporting, during the first year under new sponsorship, neither the project staff nor the coordinator knew of the terms of affiliation with the larger agency until nearly a year afterwards. The project staff had felt that the study center board should affiliate with some agency which could give supervision. Nearly a year after affiliation, the board began to make plans for fund-raising and became very concerned about their ability to fulfill the terms of affiliation, which turned out to have required a $5,000 contribution from the study center board to the larger agency annually. Their most successful fund-raising venture had raised $1,500 the year before, and the man who had given them the furniture and held three fund-raising benefits for them had gone out of business. Their discussions about raising the money appeared to the coordinator to be quite unrealistic, since when the amount of the donation was first discussed, the group began to plan a bake-sale in the neighborhood. It seems doubtful that this group of 50 adult volunteers can successfully raise such a sum. It seemed evident that the one fund-raising affair a year was as much as the volunteer group could manage.

The future of this center seems doubtful, although the larger agency is committed to supporting it.

History of South Shore

In October 1963, the Social Action Committee of a synagogue decided to start a tutoring project for local elementary children. Their community which in 1950 had been a white upper middle class [illegible] community, had begun to change in 1961 as a result of in-migration of Negro families from an adjoining ghetto area. The first Negro families to move in were middle class families, but this changed in the past three years so that many "transitional" families began to move in also. The Negro children moving in had difficulty in the schools, because the standards of the schools were generally higher than those from which they had moved.

The sponsoring group visited several other centers in the city, and then found rent-free space in a local YWCA. They were not interested in running a center, but in seeing that one was available to the community. They recruited volunteers, assembled a donated library and about $300 worth of teaching materials. The space available was a large room, full of card tables and chairs, and a small office. These facilities were used by many other groups, but were available five afternoons a week after school for the tutoring project.

A volunteer from the Social Action Committee supervised the first year of operation. The children included both Negro and white children, about one third of them being white. The staff was predominantly white volunteers, with four Negroes. Nearly all were housewives, with only a few single adults. Two of the young volunteers were men, the only men involved in the program. Half of the volunteers were Jewish, recruited from several synagogues in the area. During the first year, seventy tutors worked with approximately one hundred twenty children. Most volunteers saw two children individually, one afternoon a week. Some preferred to work with only one child.

There were no paid staff during the first year, and supervision was provided by four professional teachers who offered to help the volunteers if they would come to their homes by appointment. These women did not work actively in the center, and volunteers found their help very unsatisfactory. The teachers tended to be technical in their approaches to the children's problems, and would insist that one specific [illegible] or book, which they preferred, be used for the [illegible] forty-five minutes with the child. The volunteers felt that neither they nor the children could work within these restrictions and they usually ignored them, but they felt that they had to "bootleg" materials into the center and resented this. The turnover in staff and children gradually increased until by May, the project seemed destined for failure.

An advisory board had been formed the previous January. It was composed of successful professional people from the community, most of whom would accept the assignment only if it were a matter of volunteer public service in which they were interested. They realized that the center must have some paid help, and asked the YMCA to provide it. The center closed for the summer, and by fall, when it reopened, the YMCA had agreed to run the study center as one of its services and assigned a young man coordinator from their staff. Although interested and willing to work in the project, there was a tremendous organization problem to get the center started again, after the unsatisfactory experience of the previous year. A housewife with an M.A. in social work, who was on the board of the YMCA, was asked to help. She agreed to do so, if she could accept the assignment as a volunteer. In order to allow her to accept credit [illegible] semester for college "field work" requirements, it was necessary for her to be hired, and so she was officially hired as "volunteer coordinator" at a salary of $1 a year.

With two adults on duty every afternoon, the center opened again in October with a small volunteer staff. The former volunteers, who had left in large numbers, began to return. They said that they felt learned that the center was now properly organized and that they had actually left because of their dissatisfaction with the job, rather than for the valid reasons they had previously given. If the center had not been reorganized, a variety of perfectly legitimate reasons for drop-out of volunteers would have been recorded, obscuring the real reasons for the failure of the project.

For three years, the volunteer housewife who accepted this assignment continued to supervise the center. She had the help of one staff person from the YMCA, a young man, each year. In addition, since she could supervise students of social work, she accepted four field-work placements each year, two each semester. This center was, during her time as coordinator, one of the best run tutoring projects in the city.

The student body changed rather rapidly. Each semester, there were fewer white students, until in the third year, the population of the center consisted entirely of Negro children. The volunteer staff of housewives gradually diminished as the neighborhood continued to change.

With the assignment of new manpower resources, the YMCA also provided more financial resources for materials, averaging $100 a year. From twenty-five volunteers who returned from the first year, the staff was able to build up to an average number of sixty-eight, who saw ninety children during the academic year. In all, eighty-three volunteers were involved in the second year for some period of time, and one hundred seven children were referred by the schools. Of the eighty-three volunteers, sixty-four were housewives, seven were high school students, seven college students, and three teachers, either active or retired. Of the one hundred and seven children, ten were discontinued because they moved or the center felt they could not be helped, four dropped out apparently due to lack of interest, and three were graduated because they were reported by their teachers to no longer need the help.

In December of the second year, after the successful reorganization of the center, the research project offered to give academic tests to the children being tutored. Both the volunteers and staff felt that these tests were so helpful to them and to the children that they made arrangements to continue testing, and to share the results with the project staff.

This center presented a very middle-class appearance, in contrast to other centers in poor neighborhoods. Children came only by school referral, and only by appointment. The study center, on the second floor of the YMCA, was on a commercial street, easily available to volunteers but very different from those which were open to view and available to children walking in from the street. The volunteer group always included a number of older women, and the average age of the volunteers was the highest among the centers observed by the study. Several observers felt that the atmosphere was not very unlike school, except that each child had a volunteer to himself. The atmosphere was definitely one of academic orientation, and the emphasis was always on work in academic skills. Gradually, because of the increased diversity of the volunteers, the program became less rigidly academic. During the second year, for instance a volunteer taught a child to knit, an activity which would have been frowned upon as improper a year before. This was the only center, in our observations, which became gradually less rigid and in which a variety of educational materials gradually began to be used. Most centers followed the opposite pattern. Because of the lack of skill of volunteers, and the unwillingness of children to respond to "more school," the volunteers are tempted to use many more games at first, or just allow the children to talk.

This center always closed a few weeks before the end of the school year and reopened about October 1. The third year, the center had a total of ninety-three tutors, with twenty-nine returning from the previous year. Of this total, seventy-three were housewives and single women, six were college students, thirteen had taught at one time or another, and one was a social worker. A total of one hundred and eighteen children were seen during the year. The four field-work students, in addition to the two adults regularly at the center, made up the rest of the staff.

During that year, the schools in the area began after-school reading classes for children who were retarded in reading. Because of the close cooperation between the center and the schools, the schools asked that the children continue to attend the study center, and excused those who were in the school program one day of the week to allow them to receive individual help at the center. Near the end of the year, they appealed to the center to take more children, since they were not satisfied with the progress some of the children had made in these classes and felt that they might do better with individual help. The center was able to include several new children from these classes near the end of the year. The after school classes continued during the next year, but the school continued to cooperate in allowing children for tutoring lessons, since they felt that the individual help was useful.

This was the only center known to the project staff to receive this kind of cooperation from the schools. In all other centers, children registered for after-school classes had to withdraw from volunteer programs. Only those few centers which were conducted in the evening hours were not affected by the new school programs.

The following fall, forty volunteers returned, but the resources of the neighborhood had definitely changed. Many of the previous tutors had accepted jobs and others had moved away. The shortage of volunteers was solved by having six Negro work study students, who worked five hours a week, assigned from a local college. One was a substitute, and the others each saw eight students a week, thus giving 40 children academic help once a week. The need for the service continued to rise, while the supply of local volunteers diminished rapidly.

In addition, a group of high school students came one day a week. Their attendance was erratic, and they seemed to feel that as long as an appropriate number of students came, it was not necessary for the same students to be there each week. Their students' scores did show less progress than those children who were seen regularly by the same volunteers. They also travelled a distance by bus, and the bus occasionally broke down. They were encouraged to find a project nearer to their school and left after the year.

This center was the only one among the four that was located in a middle class community. It was the only center that [illegible] a number of children every year. These were capable youngsters [illegible] been good students in their former ghetto schools, but found themselves in trouble in the new schools, with higher standards. Because they were capable, their progress was excellent. They were children who initially scored less than a year below their reading level. There were twelve such students the second year, and 10 the third year.

In the fall of 1967, the volunteer coordinator took a new job, and the supervision of the center was shared by a white woman college student, a junior majoring in English, and two Negro work study freshman (women) students from a local college. The college junior was considered the coordinator, but she was at the center only three afternoons a week. When she was not there, the two younger women students shared the responsibility of running the program.

Because of the continual decrease of volunteers and the absence of field work placements, since there was no longer supervision for them, the new staff tried to offer reading, history, mathematics and science clubs one afternoon a week. These were set for Friday, and despite having capable volunteers available for clubs, only four children responded, so the idea of clubs was abandoned.

The college which had provided students the previous year withdrew their students after the first semester. Their supervisor felt that there was no longer meaningful supervision available to her students. Authority seemed divided and indefinite; the three students involved in running the center were overwhelmed by the job and made mistakes which could not have been predicted, but which were obviously the result of inexperience. They particularly fell down in the difficult job of assigning pre-adolescent and adolescent girls, and [illegible] them indiscriminately, it seemed, to young male students from the junior college. These young men, both Negro and white, found themselves bewildered by the seductive behavior of the girls. There was a lack of follow-through with the children when they did not attend, and volunteers became discouraged. Absenteeism again became a major problem, but they allowed both volunteers and children to sit and wait for their tutors or students, session after session.

At the beginning of the second semester of the fifth year, the YMCA board decided to close the study center at the end of the school year. The coordinator had continued to share the test results and information about the project with the research staff, but it had become obvious that the three young students now in charge of the center were not capable of keeping even the minimum attendance records. From observation, the volunteers were becoming discouraged and there was a continual problem of absent volunteers and children. The previous financial commitment of the YMCA for a salary for one coordinator, combined with a professional coordinator who was available as a volunteer, had been sufficient to supervise a program of approximately one hundred children. The new coordinator was only at the center three days a week, and did not have immediate professional supervision. When she was absent, the two work-study students who were in charge were not clear about the divided responsibility. The neighborhood continued to change, and the supply of middle-class housewives who originally made up the bulk of the volunteer staff could not be recruited. The use of high school students bussed in did not seem satisfactory even when professional supervision was available on the job, because [illegible] supervision from their own school. The college students who were available from junior colleges in the area had excellent supervision from their college staff, but felt that there was no longer meaningful supervision on the job.

The basic orientation material used in this center was always the pamphlet After-School Study Centers. During the first year that the center cooperated with the project, a booklet of case summaries was offered to the center but rejected by the staff since "volunteers are not allowed to take children on trips and they are mentioned in several of the cases." A year later, the study center staff mentioned that some children were taken on trips by volunteers, and the project staff asked if this were a new policy. The staff seemed unaware of their early qualms about trips, and said they saw no reason why volunteers should not be allowed to do this, if they wished. Trips away from the center remained an exception to the rule, and were never considered an important part of the program. Neither the coordinators nor the volunteers knew the parents, who were contacted mainly in the case of children not attending or not making what the staff felt to be adequate use of the opportunity to be tutored. The parents of these children were called and told that the child was not making adequate progress, or was absent too often, and would have to drop out. Both the families and children were usually upset about this procedure, so the center staff suggested that the child come for general homework help for several weeks, and when they were convinced that the child was serious about wanting help, he would be reassigned. This policy was generally successful.

There was never any charge for attending the center. No provision for snacks was ever made, or considered important. At the end of each semester the volunteers provided refreshments for a party for the children. These parties were still defined very much in terms of the every day tutoring. Volunteers and their children continued their lessons at individual tables, while the staff prepared an attractive table with napkins, cookies and juice. Each volunteer walked over with his or her student and carried refreshments back to their table and ate them alone. Parties in the other centers usually involved entertainment for the children, or participation by them in games or dancing.

With two coordinators, one of whom was a professional, it was possible to run a project involving approximately one hundred children. As the supply of neighborhood volunteers decreased, the presence of a professional coordinator, a social worker, enabled the project to continue with the help of field-work students and work-study students. Only the work-study students continued after the center was run entirely by non-professionals, and they had to assume responsibility for supervision, for which they seemed unqualified. The college student who was officially the coordinator, on the three days she attended the center, had a month's training on the job in running the program with the professional social worker. But, when the center opened, the college student was in charge. The kinds of mistakes she made could hardly be foreseen, such as [illegible] a child who had worked successfully for a year with a middle-class [illegible] to a student from the junior college, feeling that the students had to have assignments since they were receiving academic credit for their work.

However, such problems which at first seemed the main ones, were not as basic as the lack of ability to keep adequate records of attendance and follow-up on students and volunteers who missed. The young women seemed reluctant to assert themselves to see that volunteers and children who did come were given work to do, and gradually the groups of unattached volunteers and children grew, so that a great deal of time was wasted while these groups sat and visited at separate tables. Naturally they became discouraged and began to drop out.

The social worker did train a number of young coordinators, with the assignment of a new one each year, but they always moved on to better jobs. Two of the young staff people assigned to her were young white men, and the third was a young Negro man interested in youth work. He was the most successful of the three, and all three felt that they received very valuable experience and training during their academic year of work with the center.

The YWCA board decided that they could not put enough money into the supervision of the center to adequately continue. Also the elementary schools which were primarily served by the center were beginning in-school tutoring programs and it was hoped that these would develop successfully. Several neighborhood residents who had been involved in the study center became involved in the in-school programs.

History of Welles-Darrow

In the winter of 1964, the Chicago Housing Authority was aware of twenty-five tutoring projects being conducted in or near public housing facilities. They had allotted space for several of these, and now decided to put even more resources into such efforts. The Tenant Relations Officer of the central office offered to show several available sites to the project staff, in hopes that a study center could be developed in cooperation with the research project.

The best facility available was one of the old housing projects with a mixture of high-rise and low-rise housing. There are 2,836 apartments in this community; the population is all Negro. As of December, 1966, 690 (slightly less than one-fourth) of the total of 2,836 families were on public aid. More than one-third of the families (1,201), had yearly income of under $3,000. The maximum limit permissible by housing projects was a yearly income of $6,300 for a family of five and a yearly income of $5,800 for a family of four. Of the 2,386 families, 985 (or slightly less than one-third) had both parents, and another 1,135 were one-parent families. The remainder were single and elderly people. The average number of persons per family in this project was 4.1 and of that, an average of 2.6 were minors.

In each housing project a number of Community Tenant Relations Aides work with individual families and with community agencies. One of the aides in this project asked to be assigned to the study center, because of personal interest. She was a Negro woman with social work training who had been working in this project for a few months, but who had worked for another public housing staff for ten years. She contacted the block clubs and building councils, which are local parent groups with whom she meets monthly. This group of parents is selected to represent the larger community, so that slightly less than half of the council participants are fathers.

The research staff was invited to a council meeting to explain the development of study centers in Chicago, and the possibility of using the facility in which the parents meet for this purpose. The building was an attractive two-family dwelling which had been converted for office use by knocking out the walls between the two units. Since the office presently housed there would be moved, it was planned to use this building for a variety of group needs, such as job training, and youth and parent meetings. The six-room facility had two large rooms on the first floor--approximately sixteen feet by ten feet each--with a kitchen area in one room. The second floor had two bathrooms and four smaller rooms, the smallest of which had a telephone and was used as an office. The building was attractively painted and maintained by CHA staff. The parent group was enthusiastic in their wishes to have such a facility for their children.

The research project had developed a homework center in a settlement house about a mile from the new facility in CHA. The physical facility had been found unsatisfactory because of the variety of other groups using the building. The volunteer staff included five faculty wives from a nearby college and about twenty students. The faculty wives were enthusiastic about the possibility of developing a better program in the new facility, and it was hoped that college students would be able to travel to the new facility. This turned out to be not feasible, because of the distance and the afternoon hours. The students became involved in other closer projects that met in the evenings and on Saturdays.

When the facility was ready in June of 1965, a collection of books was made in the suburbs by the auxilliary of an eastern university. This collection of approximately 800 books were placed in shelves built by CHA in the larger of the two rooms on the first floor. (The other room had a kitchen area, which had been removed from the larger room.) Since the nearest library was across a very busy double street, parents had reported that it was not available to their small children. Chicago Housing Authority provided a variety of educational materials, installed blackboards in each of the upstairs rooms, and provided juice and cookies for refreshments each day.

Since the school year was ended before the new center opened, the local Community and Relations Aide assumed responsibility for recruiting children. After eliminating those children from the total population of the immediate area who were known to be either retarded, superior in school achievement, or severe behavior problems, she had a list of seventy-five children. From this list, the first forty were selected and thirty-seven were interested.

A six week summer program was planned to be conducted four mornings a week from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon. The children from third and fourth grades would attend two mornings a week, and those from fifth and sixth grades would attend on the other mornings. When registration night was held, twenty-nine children were registered, and it was decided that these children instead of recruiting more children would attend every day. Some of the others attended regular summer school classes at the local school, and this project was designed for those who did not qualify for such help. There were also other volunteer programs available which were all-day programs, at least one of which served lunch. Some children, whose parents wanted a longer program for them, attended those.

The five volunteers who had previously worked with the project at the other setting were asked to help plan the program in terms of their own interests. In the former setting they had worked in homework help, but, since it was summer, there would not be any homework and the morning program offered an opportunity for group work. While only one of the five had taught school, the others had had a variety of experiences working with their own children, or with church groups. They were somewhat apprehensive of group work, since the groups in the former setting had been most difficult, and they realized that such work would require careful planning. Several meetings were held in which they were encouraged to explore their interests and decide in what kinds of group activities they would like to work. It was obvious that their year of experience in the other homework center had given them enough self-assurance to try a new venture. The experienced teacher wanted to have a science group twice a week. Two others had some experience in arts and crafts and another, an art student, was encouraged to develop an art program, and did so only with the assurance that her friends would work with her.

In addition to the faculty wives, who were white, one other volunteer from the previous setting was interested in working in the new center. She was a middle-aged Negro woman who had taught for several years in the South. She had been successful as a volunteer for three months in the former setting. She was highly recommended by the staff of the settlement house for a paid position in the center, and was hired as a coordinator-in-training. The project coordinator was in charge of the new center, but it was hoped that local personnel could be trained to run the center.

Since the coordinator-in-training lived just outside of the housing project, no attempt was made to get a recommendation from the housing authorities, which turned out to be an error. After she was hired, the local CHA staff people found out, by contacts with people who knew her, that she was said to be a "racist ." The change in this woman, once she was given authority, came as a complete shock to the volunteers who had previously worked with her. Although the project coordinator was in charge of the center, her position of "coordinator-in-training" immediately set her apart. She was the only staff person who insisted that the staff discuss rules with the children on the first day. Small groups were formed, and the children encouraged to define what they considered appropriate behavior in such a center. It became obvious to her that the rest of the staff had been correct in thinking that the children would not present behavior problems, and she quickly said so. However, she showed her authority by ordering volunteers to "stay in certain rooms" during their classes, which they felt unnecessary and sometimes an imposition since they went [illegible] the freedom to use the various-sized rooms and the yard outdoors as they wished. Of much more concern to them, however, were her comments to the children "you like me best, because we understand each other." Such comments caused the children to withdraw from her.

The project coördinator felt unable to handle the situation, and the volunteers appealed to the Tenant Aide. She made an appointment with the coordinator-in-training, and told her that "in my experience with study centers, I have found it better to work with volunteers as equals and consider them partners in making decisions." (She afterwards admitted that her "experience in study centers" was, in fact, limited to several weeks.) The woman seemed to understand, and her attitude toward the volunteers changed. However, the children continued to feel uncomfortable with her although she stopped her references to their common background. She seemed puzzled by the children's obvious acceptance of the volunteers, and became the keeper of records and a general helper. Since she had no special skills to share, she tried to be genuinely helpful in various activities, and seemed to become aware that the volunteers were deserving of her support. The diplomacy of the volunteers was tremendous and they made it as easy for her to change her role as they could. However, when her husband suddenly decided to move out of the state three weeks after the summer school started, the staff was quite relieved.

Two private school teachers who had formerly taught in public school came as volunteers four days a week to the program. They taught reading and creative writing in groups, giving as much individual help to the children as possible. One child, who was going into third grade and could not read a word, was taught to read by one of the teachers who gave him daily lessons. Two other children had daily lessons. Even before the coordinator-in-training left, these two women had become informal leaders of the group. Because of their obvious experience and ability to work with children and since they were at the center every day, the other volunteers turned to them for help. Their participation in the program impressed the parents the most, and was often commented on by them.

The two experienced teachers judged the children to range from one to two years retardation in reading, and felt that no child in the program was functioning at his normal grade level. When the children were tested in the fall, this turned out to be true. This was impressive, in terms of many other programs tested by the project staff. Since this center was set up in cooperation with a parent's council, it might be expected that some parents would exert pressure to have their children included. A Tenant Aide had succeeded in recruiting the only group of study center children the project staff had seen who uniformly needed academic help, with no aid from the school involved. This performance was never repeated in any of the centers tested by the staff or with our cooperation until several years later in another housing project, where a local mother was hired by the poverty program to coordinate a center, and personally recruited the students.

With the end of summer school, a graduation was held to which most of the families came. Certificates and donated ballpoint pens were presented to the children, and a guest speaker from a local agency discussed the importance of education with the children and parents. This was arranged by the professional staff of the center and although well-received, was obviously a poor choice of entertainment.

In the fall, the center reopened as a homework center as planned. A white woman in her thirties who had been a school librarian was hired to coordinate the center, and the faculty wives continued to help. Six mothers and teen-age daughters from the housing project joined the faculty wives as volunteers. The children who had attended summer school returned, but it was obvious that they needed much more than homework help.

The parents and sisters of this group could give limited academic help, and the immediate problem was that they often felt impelled to tell the children that an assignment was correctly done, when it was not. The entire volunteer staff had to be told to check with the coordinator, "since she had worked in a public school setting and knew what teachers wanted." This system worked quite well, and the high school youngsters especially seemed capable of becoming effective homework helpers. However, as the holidays approached, both mothers and teen-age girls found temporary jobs to make money for Christmas. The volunteer mother who seemed most capable was hired as an assistant coordinator two days a week.

At the end of the first semester of the school year, the school began after-school reading classes, and the children in this center were all qualified to attend except for one boy who was EMH (educable mentally handicapped). The staff encouraged the children, and recommended to the parents that the children attend, since they were all at least a year retarded in reading. Only one child refused to go, and continued at the study center.

The school was asked which children they would like the center to serve, and they recommended children from their "top track" classes. These eighteen children joined the center and were offered homework help four afternoons a week. When they were tested, ten were found to read at grade level or above and the other eight were behind grade level. Two of them were less than a half year behind, but six of them had average scores a year behind their present grade level. These children were extremely motivated to succeed in school, and the volunteers found them much easier to work with. Although they were all good students, according to the school, and achieved superior grades, the volunteers felt that their achievement was actually barely normal for their grade level and ability. The children brought their papers from school every day--papers which were certainly not impressive--and everything they did was marked "good" or "excellent" with no comments. While they were certainly superior in achievement to the group which had preceeded them, they seemed aware that they needed help. The emphasis of the volunteer staff was on better work, and when the children asked for criticism, they received it. Because they did not have homework consistently enough, or finished it early in the afternoon, they spent some time reading or writing everyday.

The parents of the new group of children were not available to help in the center. Nearly all of them were involved in some form of job training, and at least three of the mothers were attending college. The CHA office provided two work-study students to supplement the volunteer staff each semester.

The children who were referred that winter from the top tracks of their school formed the nucleus of the group that remained in this center for the next two years. Homework help and group activities seemed most appropriate for them. They were much more able to function as members of a group than were the more severely retarded children who had preceded them, and this was important in a center with only three or four adults available each day. They also responded to encouragement to help each other, and were most capable as homework helpers. All of them showed very good gains on reading tests and those who were further ahead to begin with made the most progress.

In April, a group of Negro and white employees from a local business were recruited for a once-a-week tutoring program. The children who were below grade level were included in this group. Only one insisted that, since her grades were so good and she was a good student, she did not need this help. After studying her own test again, she asked if she could be included. The group of tutors were recruited from one company and showed very high group morale. Originally, there were 14 members, but some withdrew from tutoring and became involved in fund-raising, which they preferred, when their children stopped attending. When the project staff suggested recruiting from other sources to make better use of the building, this group became quite upset, saying they wanted "their own program." They recruited more volunteers, and averaged about fifteen volunteers a week. The coordinator from the afternoon program was also responsible for the evening tutoring program. It soon became obvious that the group considered the tutoring as primarily a social activity which they obviously enjoyed. Most were young women, with high school education. About a third had attended one year of college. Only one man (a white supervisor) was recruited to the program, and then suddely transferred and found it impossible to attend. The tutoring was limited to homework help, and it soon became obvious that these young people had not liked school themselves and found academic work distasteful. They soon began to encourage games, which they obviously enjoyed, and spent much of the evening talking or listening to their students. When educational games were offered, one actually said "no, that's an educational game--I don't like that kind--I like Sorry better" (a simple boxed game). The program became a kind of Big Sister operation. They liked the children, and the relationship to an outsider was welcomed by the parents, who expressed appreciation of the volunteer's interest. Group spirit was very high--absences were not easily forgiven, and there was a great deal of conversation at work about "their project" and "their children."

The volunteers took trips with most of the children--sometimes, in pairs or small groups. They took the children to dinner, either in restaurants or at their homes. A few trips to museums were taken but the trips usually involved having dinner or lunch, or going to church together. This is the only project in the city that the staff knows of that includes predominantly Negro women from a company, and the only program in which there was a pattern of taking the children to church.

A supervisor from the office had, from the beginning, been in charge of recruitment and coordinated their plans. They held a series of fund-raising events in the office, and contributed $600 to the center. This, and the special outings they planned for the children, were their most successful efforts and seemed to be the part of the program they enjoyed. Several times, they gave holiday parties for the group of children. These involved a movie and a lunch. The lunches were not designed by anyone who knew about giving children's parties; they rejected any suggestions that they have foods which children like, and wanted these to be "very special." They were the kinds of luncheons that would ordinarily be designed for women's groups--with elaborate casseroles and dainty sandwiches. Nevertheless, these social affairs gave the group enormous satisfaction, and the children seemed to enjoy knowing young adults who were obviously successful.

The supervisor from the local office remained, for several months, deeply concerned about the lack of academic interest on the part of the volunteers. However, she gradually became resigned to accepting the project as primarily a social one. Only a couple of volunteers went off to find a quiet space to workwith their students, and these were the ones who were seriously giving academic help. The others preferred the company of each other, and aside from the necessary homework, spent the evening in a variety of games, many of which they seemed to enjoy even more than the children did. The children were there during the afternoons too, and they were put in the position of teaching games to the adults, which they enjoyed. During the summers the evening program was abandoned, but the same group returned the next fall and continued the same kind of program.

After the first semester, the coordinator withdrew from the evening tutoring program. The group preferred to have their own supervisor run the program. She was one of two white women in the group, and was their supervisor at work. It was basically a group which seemed unmotivated toward academic work. They originally wanted to have a tutoring program, but seemed to be incapable of doing so because of their own complete lack of interest in education. Two years later, the program still continues as a kind of friendship club, but with the active participation of the social worker from the CHA staff, in addition to the supervisor from the local business office. While it cannot be called a "tutoring program," the setting does provide for encouragement and help in doing homework and some contact with adults from outside the housing project. This seems to mean a great deal to the children who live there, and the mothers are grateful for any help in doing homework and some contact with adults from outside the housing project. To the children, these well-dressed, attractive and obviously successful young Negro women from outside the housing project are a meaningful link with another world.

From the beginning, the children of the housing project were impressive in their acceptance of all outsiders, and their obvious delight in meeting people from "outside." After the experience of having a few mothers and sisters help with homework, there were no Negroes involved in the staff except for the assistant coordinator and the work-study students. The assistant coordinator was a mother who successfully motivated her own children and she extended this to the others. Her only special skill in group work was in arts and crafts, but it was important that she had some skill, because the volunteers who came always had. (She reacted strongly when one boy joined a gang, asking the others immediately, "are you joining too?" Whey they shook their heads no, she immediately said "good--don't join one.") She felt personally concerned, as outsiders could not, about the neighborhood, and this obvious concern made her presence different from the others. She, like the mothers and teen-age sisters, seemed to enjoy the experience of working with white women. Having this image of white and Negro adults working together with obvious mutual respect and personal satisfaction was perhaps the biggest contribution of this center.

The staff was very early impressed with the lack of race consciousness on the part of the children. In both other poor neighborhoods, where the staff worked in centers, racial remarks were sometimes heard. These were obviously reflections from the home--"The white people helping poor dumb Negro kids." Only at the housing project was no such remark ever heard, either in the center or on the street, and it was inconceivable to the staff that the children ever would. Obviously, from the integrated staff at CHA or the schools, the children had grown up with a conviction that people are individuals and deserve to be judged as such. It was, to the staff, a most impressive tribute to the parents, who had raised their children in a Negro ghetto while somehow teaching them obvious respect for all people. When discussed with the CHA staff, they felt that this was due to the selection of the group, and the age group served.

While the recial situation became increasingly tense in other neighborhoods, there was never a problem of volunteers coming to this area. From the beginning, the evening group of volunteers were told that a guard was posted across the street, and if they were late in leaving, he came to see why. The young Negro women had to be discouraged from accompanying the children up to their doors in apartment buildings in the evening. By the third summer program in the summer of 1967, one change did take place. The coordinator began to lock the door during the day time, because young men sometimes came by to ask for a match, or to find out what was going on in the building. This kind of "hanging around" was unknown during the first two summers. Also, CHA asked that the graduation ceremony take place in the afternoon instead of the evening because of possible tension. This made graduation much less impressive--not nearly so many parents could attend. But it also gave the volunteers the conviction that their welfare was very much a matter of concern to the authorities, and was accepted as the precautionary measure that it was meant to be.

The children at the housing project differed in important respects from the children of poor, disorganized neighborhoods in which North Park and STEP were located. They were better dressed, and they talked of having "allowances," which were unknown to the other children. It was impressive to the staff that children from families of under $3,000 income were nevertheless given allowances. They also had specific jobs to do at home. The children from the other centers seemed to be given jobs at random, and this perhaps explained their known preferences for staying in the street. The children of the housing project know what their jobs were for the week, and they were often paid for doing extra jobs. In the poorer neighborhoods, the children never talked about being paid for anything, and seemed much more apt to be "stuck with jobs to do" if they happened to be around when relatives come with small children, for instance. Then it was the unlucky one who was near who was told to take care of the child, and felt sorry for herself. There was much lack of awareness of what was fair, or appropriate for a child of a certain age. Seven and eight year old children were made responsible for toddlers, and punished severely if they let the child get hurt or dirty. Housing project children talked of different jobs, by age. "I'm old enough to wash dishes now--my little brother empties waste baskets and he only gets a nickel." Children in the more disorganized, poor neighborhoods never expressed any such specific notions of growing up, and seldom talked of specific jobs which were theirs at home. There was a definite feeling that, if you were older, you were asked to do more, but there was no expressed awareness or understanding of pride in growing up.

Of course, the children with whom we had most contact in the housing project were the upwardly mobile families, but the staff was continually impressed with the "middle class" standards that were incorporated into these homes. Both groups of children, the earlier group of very retarded ones and the later group, talked a good deal of the future, when they would move out of the project. This concerned the staff, who felt that the children were far better off, because they were in a housing project that was well maintained and far more attractive, than the families in other neighborhoods who lived in deteriorated apartments, in most depressing surroundings. The fact that most of the children will continue to live in the project through childhood made the staff wish that somehow they could help them to understand that their parents had moved there because they wanted the best available housing for their children. The only contribution the staff was able to make was to have two graduates of the community come back to visit. Apparently, the wish to move out and dreams of doing so are just a part of living in such an area, and part of the reality of their lives. It actually shows that they share the American dream of mobility, and no one would wish to deny or attack these dreams, but the staff always felt that somehow, there might develop more awareness of pride in the present reality. This cannot be, probably because of the way society defines such areas.

These children were poor, by financial standards, but they did not consider themselves so. They sometimes talked about poverty. They had read about it and had seen pictures of children in other countries who suffered from malnutrition --that was poverty to them. They were also aware that they did not live in "slums." They could identify some in a deteriorated neighborhood near the project. Yet, when a group of children from a housing project is mentioned in the daily newspapers, the term "slum" is always used.

Driving past the project, no one would identify the area of brick duplexes and low rise apartment buildings as public housing. Talking to the children, one would become aware of very middle-class hopes and values. But since the larger society continually defines them with labels, and their neighborhood as slums, the staff limited its concern to accepting them as they would have any other group of children. The fact that volunteers who worked in various settings continually referred to these children as the "nicest group they ever worked with" was the result of the volunteer's awareness of how much the physical setting contributed to the well-being of these families and the impressive job that parents obviously can do in bringing up children on limited incomes.

This project remained a homework center during the academic year, with various activities offered according to the abilities of the volunteer staff. Sewing was a favorite project for the girls, and woodworking for the boys. Drama activities were very popular with both. If the children did not have homework, they were encouraged to read or write during the first forty-five minutes of the afternoon. They soon became involved in special projects, which were often available at school. Several built displays for science fairs, others accepted suggestions from the volunteer staff to make displays or reports on something of special interest to them. Their reaction was very often that the other children "would not understand" and they were told that their job was to present the information so that other children would understand. After the academic period, the children had juice and cookies. Groups or individuals would report briefly for ten or fifteen minutes on their activities and then the children would participate in drama, sewing, woodworking or crafts.

The group experience seemed to be very valuable as the children originally seemed to have little ability to work together. It was a place to make friendships, belong to a group, and to do worthwhile activities. Many of the children should do well in high school and college, and there developed a strong spirit of comraderie about their membership in the center. They learned to help each other, and to help younger children. Most of all, they supported each other in their efforts to be good students. The support of each other was the main goal of the staff. It is not easy to be a good student in a poor neighborhood, and the hope is that the children will be more able to ask for help from teachers and counsellors, and much more able to support one another. There was no way otherwise for the group to get together, and there were no other facilities available for bright, achieving children who wanted a library setting.

More than any other center in the city, this one was run very largely by the children involved. Preparing juice and cookies was a favorite job for the girls. The coordinator took attendance, but the children participated very actively in all planning for activities and projects. There were always some children helping others with homework. The library was always run by children, sometimes older sisters who came in each day just for that activity. The children assumed responsibility for straightening up the games and materials in the cupboards, and for keeping them in good repair. Because of the small volunteer staff every day, the help of the children was crucial, but it also gave them enormous pride. They would ask for jobs to do, and it was necessary to take turns with most jobs.

During the second year, twenty-five children who attended nearly every day were asked to fill out a form of what they liked about the center especially, and of what they disliked. They especially liked the coordinator, their individual tutors, if they had one, and the friendship of other children. Twenty children circled "not enough rules" and "too much noise" as one factor they disliked about the center. Three considered it "too quiet" and one had as her only complaint that the center "should not serve juice and cookies." One child said there should be a "leading class" at the center, obviously referring to the track system in the school and the lack of it at the study center. While they seemed to function very well in such a setting, without what they considered "rules," it was interesting that they overwhelmingly marked only these two, "too much noise" and "not enough rules," as criticisms of the center. Since practically all of the children marked those two items as criticisms, it seems that they did not really feel as comfortable about the freedom offered by the center as they appeared to. At least, given the opportunity of an anonymous questionnaire, they expressed the belief that the center ought to "be more quiet" and "have more rules."

Summer programs at this center were the most rewarding part of the experience, since it was then that the children especially needed activity. They did not qualify for any program available, because they were not in need of remedial help and there were not enough classes of enrichment available. These programs are described separately.

After the project terminated its support of the after-school homework center, it was planned to recommend that the assistant coordinator be hired to run the homework program. However, the coordinator wanted to continue with the group which had been with the center for two years and many of whom were entering eighth grade. She did so, as a volunteer, for a semester. By then, three of the children had been encouraged to take tests for admission to special high schools. Others were entering the local high school and would place in the upper tracks there, because of their achievement. The center was taken over by CHA for more job-training programs for both men and women and the center discontinued. For at least the remainder of the academic year, the coordinator and volunteers planned a series of monthly meetings with the children to explore the city and visit homes of volunteers. Although the daily attendance of the center averaged fifteen the last semester of the homework center, children who attended the summer program were included in this group, so that the group involved numbered thirty-five to forty.

The primary attachment of children in this center was to the coordinator, who was at the homework center everyday. The majority of the children will enter high school next fall and there are no plans to continue formal contact with them. However, the volunteer staff was aware for a long time that jobs for children under sixteen are a major problem for the children of the housing project. The only readily available job for boys is to carry groceries out from a nearby supermarket. Because the volunteers have worked in the community for more than two years, they know that it is perfectly safe to drive there. It has been possible to get baby-sitting jobs for some of the girls in the faculty housing from which the volunteers come.

There seems no immediate possibility of locating comparable jobs for the twelve to fourteen year old boys.

History of STEP

After a series of sit-in demonstrations by University of Chicago undergraduates, some accepted faculty suggestions that they become involved in tutoring efforts to help a neighboring, very poor, all-Negro area adjoining the campus. Ten students visited a school in the area, five blocks from campus, and arranged to see ten seventh and eighth grade students. For several weeks, the elementary school students walked to the campus after school. Attendance was irregular, and the college students decided to find a meeting place within the children's community.

A boy's club offered two rooms and allocated $3,000 for a pilot tutoring project for the following academic year. Two women college students were hired to run this center, five afternoons a week after school. At the invitation of the student leaders, the project staff visited the center that first year. The program was not impressive as a tutoring program as only a few students were being seen regularly. There were, however, a number of group enrichment activities going on, provided by college volunteers. The staff was entirely white college students.

One problem of this group was that another student-affiliated program working with high school students in the same area had openly harrassed the schools. This new group limited their help to elementary school youngsters and was convinced that they must cooperate with the schools, in order to help the children. They often complained of the hostility toward them, because of the ill will engendered by the other group, which they felt was unjustified. From the beginning, they found it necessary to disassociate themselves completely and make it clear that theirs was a recognized student activity and that they wanted to cooperate with the schools.

There were problems in sharing the boy's club facility, which gradually became worse. The building was kept locked, and door guards let children in by specific appointments. If a child came late, he was often not allowed to come in. Children could not come in without pre-arrangement. It was obvious that this group of students would have had trouble sharing facilities with any agency, because of their lack of knowledge in working with children.

There was a tendency on the part of one of the student leaders to allow the children to become quite wild and uncontrolled and then to suddenly become angry and punitive. Children were occasionally "put out" of the center, and there was no place for them to go, except to bother other groups using the building.

This project had adequate staff, more than many other projects had. They had a good supply of purchased and donated books and reading materials. For orientation, they took a variety of available materials, rewrote them and mimeographed a paper under the name of one of the two directors. The best part of the program was the variety of activities brought in by college students, such as slides and films, games and science materials. No fee was ever charged for participation by a child. Snacks were never served or even considered by the sponsoring group.

The next December, one woman student leader who remained with the group as a volunteer came to the project staff to report on their new setting. They had found a church basement, secured additional materials, and recruited more volunteers. The student who had seemed less capable in work with children had left the project. Another woman student had been added and was available twenty hours a week under a public service fellowship at the college. Fifty student volunteers were seeing elementary school students individually twice a week, and there were group activities planned after each day's tutoring.

The project staff experience has been that college student projects were among the least stable, and that a twice-a-week tutoring commitment was unrealistic, yet, according to the attendance figures of this group, it could be done.

An advisory board of eleven student volunteers helped in administering the program, and a facility advisor from the local college served on this board. In January, the project staff agreed to cooperate with the student project to record the experiences of this group. Although about twenty volunteers had left at the end of the first semester, new ones were recruited for the second semester so that fifty volunteers were assigned to individual students. Five others helped with group activities. The majority were first and second year college students, many recruited by the coordinator, a sophomore.

The tutoring project felt that, at this time, their biggest problem was lack of contact with the schools. Some children had left and others had registered themselves and the tutoring center knew little about them. Their idea of cooperating with the schools was, at first, to ask the teachers of the children to come to the study center once a week to tell the coordinator what the children were doing in school. They were surprised to find that the project staff considered this harrassment and not feasible. They appointed one of the coordinators as a school liaison person and she planned to visit the schools weekly to find out what the children were doing there. The project staff felt that this would be very time-consuming. (It eventually turned out to be impossible.) However, the schools were visited every other week for several months and elaborate notes copied from the lesson plans, which were then shared with the volunteers. From a study of all the volunteer reports it is obvious that not the slightest use was ever made of this information.

The children were tested by the project staff and found to average a one and a half year retardation in reading. This included a wide range, from two children who were performing barely at grade level to a large number who were very severely retarded. Later, as volunteers got to know the children better, it turned out that a sizable number of the children were chronic traunts, and some had severe physical disabilities. This kind of information had not been requested from the school, and would have been more relevant than detailed lesson plans. The only factual information about the children from the schools, was their grade placement and their reading scores.

At the time that the project staff began to work with the tutoring project, the coordinator had dropped out of school to give full time to the project. She was aware of the need for some division of labor, since she was giving approximately sixty hours a week to the center, but was never able to solve this problem, because it was more individual than institutional. Attempts to assign responsibilities usually did not work out well. The public service student was assigned liaison with the schools, but it was soon obvious that this was not a rewarding assignment. Copying lesson plans gradually seemed a futile experience. Both she and the student coordinator were available every day, but attempts to work out different job assignments for them remained difficult. Because authority was divided and discipline remained an over-riding problem, a third student was assigned as "disciplinarian." The volunteers did not like this arrangement, and the staff complained that the college students did not assume enough responsibility for the behavior of their individual students. Most divisions of labor attempted were mechanical, and because of the longer involvement of the coordinator and the fact that she knew the children so much better, the actual operation of the center remained almost entirely her responsibility.

In addition to individual tutoring and short daily group activities, the center staff collected the children's writings and mimeographed a weekly newspaper. Many volunteers took their children on trips during the scheduled tutoring hours and at other times. Nearly every weekend, several volunteers took a group of children for an outing in the neighborhood.

The first observations of the project staff showed than the children arrived at the center at 3:30, but tutoring did not begin until 4. When the tutoring project asked for suggestions, this was the most obvious source of discipline troubles. Volunteers were usually there at 3:30, and very willing to begin work. They had not realized how much trouble they had invited by allowing the children to run about freely for a half hour and then try to get them to settle down to work. Everyone was pleased with the results of beginning tutoring promptly at 3:30 and, for a time, the center operated much more smoothly. However, there were no clear-cut decisions about just which types of deviate behavior they could tolerate. Absenteeism of the volunteer staff increased as the semester progressed, and children were doubled up for lessons, which accentuated the problem. The idea that discipline could be assigned to an adult who was not the person who knew the children best and had the best relationship with them seemed the most obvious mistake. Because this error was made by the executive commitese of volunteer students, and the disciplinarian was one of them, the policy was not changed. In fact, it was not even discussed openly until late in the semester, when most volunteers said in interviews that this was the biggest mistake the center had made.

After each day's tutoring lesson from 3:30 to 4:40, there were various group activities. Every day, a circle was formed with all the children and tutors present and some kind of group activity planned. Again, these were variously successful and unsuccessful. A staff person was in charge of these activies, which began with story telling and then gradually included work in simple dramatics. The staff felt that, since the children had such trouble working together, some kind of group experience was most important. This was again done rather mechanically, with the entire group. There was much discussion and disagreement of the value of these activities, since some children showed that they could not function in a group setting. When volunteers kept their children from the group situation, for what they considered good reasons, this was not always understood by the staff.

Again, the person conducting the group activity did not assume responsibility for discipline, and this was assigned to yet another student. The fact that discipline was the continual, unsolved problem of this center would seem to indicate that the appointment of "disciplinarians" did nothing but exaggerate the problem.

A continual source of tension in this center was between the janitor, an older white man, and the volunteers. They complained very much about his anger toward the children for their behavior, at the same time admitting their own inability to control the children. Despite the ruling of the church that no one could smoke there, some students did, and then complained about the janitor's complaints. While this group regularly went to outside adults for help and consultation, they were adamant about not wanting adults around the center, saying that they "would not know what to do with them."

The group dressed in school clothing when they came to the tutoring center. Some of the college students had reported comments from the children about their "nice clothing." The children were quick to notice jewelry that the women students wore, and the students had seemed aware from the beginning how much it meant to the children that they did not "dress down" for them. However, on trips away from the neighborhood the volunteers often wore their everyday outfits of jeans and sweatshirts. Whether this contributed to the problem of taking the children on trips is not obvious, but it was certainly inconsistent in terms of the policy discussed at executive committee meetings. (Since the children tended to dress "up" for these outings, the image of adults with "wrinkles ironed in" as one staff observer joked, made an incongruous sight.)

Many trips were taken with various sizes of groups of children and discipline problems were foremost on these outings. It was ironic that this group of young students were first quite gullible in believing the stories of the children about beatings at home and in school, vociferous about their disapproval, but in several instances, later resorted to physical punishment themselves. In one case, a white male student took a group of children whom he did not know well enough to a local museum, hit one of the children, and was approached and criticised by a Negro couple who witnessed the hitting. When the student coordinator asked him about it, he explained that the child had been troublesome throughout the whole trip and he saw "no alternative." She accepted this without question.

It is usual for projects to be built around the personality of one adult. In this case, the student who gave from forty to sixty hours a week to the project, remained the person to whom volunteers turned for help. She tried very hard to delegate responsibility, but always for specific functions that turned out to be unrewarding for the volunteer. Contact with the schools and teachers could have been a meaningful assignment, but the decision of the executive committee that they wanted primarily to know what was being studied in the classroom meant defining the job as copying lesson plans. No other project with which we had contact ever had such continual discipline problems; these obviously became worse when volunteers began to drop out. The solution of having an official "disciplinarian" seemed only to hinder the development of responsibility in either children or volunteers.

The records were kept on cards designed by the coordinator. This included essential information from the school, the child's appointment time, attendance record, and, on the reverse side, notes of the individual lessons by the volunteer. Blank cards were clipped to the original one, since most volunteers wrote at least brief reports on their meetings. The system meant that the information was very compact, but since the cards were continually in use, there was continual need to refile them. It was also a burdensome way to record attendance. Obviously, an attendance chart or book would have simplified matters. Individual folders on the children would have made the use of the cards for volunteer reports unnecessary. This was the most symbolic and obvious example of the coordinator's need to control the situation as much as possible. An inordinate amount of her time was spent on the job in making the cards by hand when they could have been mimeographed in a few minutes. Even after arrangements were made that the records could be left safely at the center, the coordinator insisted on this compact and controlled method of record keeping.

The student reports show that this group of volunteers were unusually successful in developing and using imaginative materials and approaches with the children. They had a great commitment to education personally, and they very seldom complained about the children being unmotivated or uninterested. Instead, they assumed that it was their responsibility to motivate them. They often walked out with restless children, and discussed academic work with them while walking around the block or to a nearby park. They wrote stories, using the children's names, which were very successful. Realizing that writing long assignments was burdensome to the children, they wrote stories, leaving blanks for the children to fill in. They used a wide variety of materials, including games, books and magazines, and assembled an impressive donated library. The children received letters from them, and answered them. Children also wrote to pen pals in other states and countries. Most impressive was a weekly newspaper of children's writings, and when this became too burdensome for the staff to manage, they accepted the offer of an adult from the community who successfully managed it.

Basically, the program was too ambitious from the beginning. To offer group activities, individual tutoring, and group trips were all useful ideas, but the group only gradually realized the variety of skills and the amount of time necessary to make these projects all work. Between the second and third month, about half of the volunteers found the commitment unfeasible and dropped out. Some complained that the operation, being too diffuse, amounted too much to "baby sitting."

The volunteers who stayed remained extremely loyal to the coordinator--many of them were her friends or had been recruited by her.

Because the project lost so many volunteers and the children began to drop out, retesting that had been planned was abandoned. Only ten children were seen for as long as six months, and these had a variety of problems. Three had physical illnesses which severely affected their school attendance. Among the ten students for whom detailed records were possible, not one would appear a likely candidate for short-term help. These children can be assumed to be typical of the student population as a whole. They were children from the street, many very severely retarded, who were more similar to the children of the storefront center than any of the more middle-class groups.

By April, when the project staff withdrew from weekly contact with the tutoring center, the executive committee had become very involved in new plans to take a group of forty children to camp the following summer. The tutoring project was closed shortly afterwards, with plans to reopen the next fall.

The coordinator of the center saw the project staff weekly, and brought suggestions back to her board. She kept detailed records of the operation of the center. The records were good, so far as the mechanical operation of the center was involved, and attempts to share the work load with other members were documented. Suggestions about consultants who might be helpful to the volunteers were followed up, but always with the contacts limited to the coordinator. She preferred to bring questions of the volunteers to consultants and to personally relay to the volunteers the information they wanted. The volunteers who stayed on in the program were unanimous in their opinion that extra professional help was their greatest need. They were also unanimous in saying that discipline remained the great unsolved problem of the center, and some better method of solving these problems should be found.

A member of the executive committee called the project staff very late in the spring, after plans were becoming definite for camp. The coordinator had asked for help from the project staff on this, but had been extremely vague about the summer plans. Because of the observations several women consultants and the women on the project staff, the coordinator had been assigned to a male staff member for supervision. This seemed to improve relations very much, and the coordinator was more receptive of ideas presented by the male faculty advisor and the male project staff member than she was of the same ideas offered by women. Unfortunately, the various attempts to share responsibility for operation of the center had all been with women, and it was not until some of the men volunteers assumed major responsibility for the summer camp that she found herself able to work effectively with other staff people.

A male member of the executive committee was put in charge of the arrangements for camp. When he called the project staff for ideas in fund-raising, he preceded his request by saying that he understood the project was against the idea of summer camps. Told that this was certainly not true, he seemed surprised. The concern of the project was that very careful planning would have to go into such a venture. He agreed, and said the committee was having trouble making any definite plans because of the vagueness of the coordinator and her desire to make all decisions. Names of people who might be of help in organizing and planning a camp were given to the group. The result of this experience was that the men students began to assume much more authority and responsibility for the entire program. After camp, they came back to report that it had been a tremendous learning experience, that they had not been adequately prepared, but that they were even more determined to make the tutoring program work. It was reorganized, so that a different student assumed responsibility for each day--similar to the term captain approach used by most college projects. Some team captains were men. This was much more successful, and when the coordinator moved out of state the following fall, the program was able to function much better because of the group's realization that they shared the job in all its aspects--including discipline. Our original suggestion that discipline has to be left to the coordinator was one that caused trouble in several centers. For the children to see men sit by quietly while only women express disapproval of them is very demoralizing. But unless there is free discussion of the shared responsibility, and unless the men are asked for help and told how they can help, they may interfere indiscriminately. For children in study centers, it seemed obvious that no matter how good the volunteers, how nice the equipment, the lack of obvious mutual respect between staff can cause any program to falter.

Other suggestions of the project staff, such as using smaller rooms upstairs instead of the huge room in the basement, were put into practice the next year, with good results. The balance between letting groups learn as a result of their own experience and trying to help them forestall the worst mistakes is a difficult one. In this case, the students had to learn a great deal on their own. It was a year before this learning enabled them to run a fairly successful program.

There was also a natural problem of finding where to turn for help. To plan expenses for camp, the group first went to an economist. They proudly showed the figures of planned expenses to a project staff member. The staff member said he was unfamiliar with the economist's qualifications for planning or running a camp, but one glance at the list showed that no food allowance had been made for the staff. From such crude beginnings, the students did manage to plan and run a camp program, and in the second year, showed themselves much more capable of running a tutoring project. It remains a center which emphasizes learning activities; there is no attempt to evaluate the efforts of volunteers and no meaningful professional supervision.

On the positive side, this group of volunteers is one of the most impressive that the project staff observed in several years of working with tutoring projects. However, the realities of their academic requirements make their very ambitious, long-range plans seem to continually fall through. If they could, like other groups, plan a short-term program of six or eight weeks, and then plan to reorganize the next phase in terms of what they learned, the problem of continually letting the children down would be solved. Community involvement of selected adults, who can be relied upon for longer periods of time, would also help, but student projects are very committed to independence. The other local project in the same area as this one turned down offers from a group of professional men who had successfully worked in a tutoring project because they were "over forty--too old to relate to children." While this group accepted one adult when the newspaper was in danger of folding, their attitude remained basically one of determination to go it alone. They have learned a good deal, but the center remains too much at the whim of whatever individuals or groups are active in any particular semester of the school year.

History of McKinley Center

The first attempt of the project staff to set up a center in the inner city was in cooperation with a small settlement house. The facility seemed adequate, with a large room approximately twenty-four feet by eighteen feet on the first floor. There were tables and chairs, portable blackboards, washrooms, a small room used as an office, and a lobby. Upstairs, there was another large room of the same size with a small room approximately fourteen feet by nine feet adjoining it. This small room had bookshelves, with an assortment of ancient books. The staff was assured that there were additional bookshelves that could be used, and some small chairs and tables that could be put in. When the agency decided to have older children and adults use the room during the day this promise proved untrue. Since the facilities were multipurpose, it would have been impossible to permanently replace the furniture. The building was not used after school and was therefore available for a study center.

The agency had city-wide programs for poor people, and setting up a center seemed a deliberate attempt to have one facility that would serve the immediate neighborhood. The director, who did not live in the neighborhood, had been with the agency for several years, but he left suddenly a few months after the study center opened.

The project coordinator in charge of setting up the center met with various local groups. The local alderman's wife recruited materials for the center, and various items which the settlement house needed, such as a refrigerator, radio and record player, and bookshelves. A nearby college recruited four women from their housing nearby. All of these volunteers came one afternoon a week. One volunteer, an experienced teacher, came two afternoons a week from a community about fifteen minutes away.

The settlement house director had also felt that he knew several local candidates for the job of coordinator-in-training, but this turned out to be untrue. A young Negro woman with two years of teachers' college training, who lived a few miles away but could commute by bus, was hired by the staff before the center opened. She and the project coordinator opened the center, and by the end of the first week there were two volunteers a day in addition to them. After the college students joined the staff there was an average of six volunteers a day. The coordinator-in-training related to the children very well. Extremely soft-spoken, she was immediately well liked by both children and volunteers. No fee was charged for attending the center. Simple snacks of fruit or cookies were provided by the project staff. The space, light, heat, and janitorial service were provided by the settlement house. It was planned as a homework center, to which children would come at 3:30, spend forty-five minutes on homework activities, have snacks, and then use a variety of group games and activities.

An important part of the interest in having a center came from a public school four blocks away. Despite the distance, there seemed no closer place available. Since the settlement house was located in a very poor neighborhood, it was planned to open a homework center, since this seemed the easiest kind of facility. There was evidence that "tutoring" was a term which could frighten prospective volunteers. The school offered to refer fifteen children from the third and fourth grades to attend the center two afternoons a week, and a group of fifteen children from the fifth and sixth grades for the other two afternoons a week. Friday had been found to be the day of the week to attract the lowest attendance children. Nearly all of the children lived in a public housing project and a few lived in apartments.

The school felt that, in order to get fifteen in each group, they had to recruit at least twice that many, since their experience had been that the children never responded in very large numbers to any extra help. However, when they referred thirty-three children for the first two groups, twenty-two children came the first week. The school wanted to make further efforts to involve the children who had not responded, but the project staff had seen the results in other centers of parental pressure to force children to attend. They preferred to work with this group and, within two weeks, other children who had not responded began to come. Six more children joined the original twenty-two. The group was made up of children who seldom or never did their homework, but whom the teachers felt would with encouragement. One child who always did his work heard about the center and asked to join. He was always the first finished, and then helped other children. The success of the effort was mainly due to the fact that the school teachers knew their individual children and assumed personal responsibility for making it work. They made special efforts to give the children meaningful homework, and to praise them for their success.

When the center opened, there was a very small library of donated books and a large supply of donated magazines. The children were most eager to take something home, and all except one checked out books and magazines. Often, the books were too hard for them, but they explained that someone at home would read to them. The magazine that was most popular was "Popular Mechanics" which seemed to be new to them. Usually they talked about their family's using the magazines, and it was obvious that they often chose materials for other members of the family. Their eagerness for books and magazines impressed the staff, and they felt that the school library must be better. However, the third graders, who were most eager for books, explained that they could not use the school library until fourth grade, unless their mothers would come in to sign for them. None of them had a library card since their mothers worked and could not go to school. Although most of the children were in the fourth grade and above, no one ever came from school with a library book.

One child refused to take anything for a long time, and finally said he was afraid to, because his little brothers would tear it up. He was encouraged to take a magazine with assurance that these were expendable. The next week he reported that it had been destroyed by a little brother, and he would not take any more. A few weeks later, he said that his mother had heard that there was a book about "Negro Heritage" at the center and wanted to read it. He reluctantly took it home, and proudly returned it intact the following week.

A suburban group was interested in supplying books and came to visit during the first month. The group of five women were enthusiastic about helping the center, but continually expressed their surprise that the children did not look "really poor." They were surprised that the children were so "neat and clean." The volunteers were convinced that the women expected to find "ragged" children, and could not understand their reluctance to realize that these children were poor. While it was true that they were extremely neat and clean, their clothes were faded and worn and often mended. Many of them wore gym shoes through the snow and rain. The staff often wondered if the children ever had clothing that was "brand new."

In the third week, the children began to talk about not doing their homework, but starting with activities and games instead. Several objected that they wanted to get it finished so it could be checked. This was enough to encourage the rest of the group. From their conversation, it was apparent that the teachers were most responsive to their doing their work and that they liked being

One little girl began to arrive with her homework completed, complimented./so that she could spend more time looking at books and magazines while other children did their homework. In the third week, they were given notebooks which were to be kept at the center and used for writing whatever they wished to write. They had been, according to their teachers, not very interested in reading or writing. This changed gradually, and the staff noticed more interest in books at the center, as well as continued interest in taking "something" home. The suburban group assembled a collection of several hundred donated books, so there were finally enough books that the children could actually read. They suddenly seemed much more interested in reading during their time at the center, and would sometimes read or reread one book and then check out another to take home.

During the second month, the coordinator-in-training complained that she did not know enough activities to offer the children, and the volunteers always seemed able to think of more ideas than she could. She wanted to be able to do more. It turned out that the written suggestions she had been given had not been used, because she was afraid she could not demonstrate the games or activities. The project director offered to help her, and she began to come to her for weekly supervision. She seemed reluctant to admit her problem to the project coordinator with whom she worked at the center. When activities and games were demonstrated to her, she was able to show them to the children, and seemed more pleased with this ability than any other part of her job.

Since the children talked so much about how their families enjoyed the books and magazines, a special activity of the week was offered to them each Wednesday and Thursday. These materials were given to the coordinator-in-training, so that she could offer the materials to the children. Sometimes, it was a page of arithmetic in squares, some of which were "magic squares" because the numbers added up horizontally and vertically produced the same sum. Sometimes, they were word games such as the scrambled names of animals, simple cross-word puzzles, hidden pictures, or a phrase or long word, to be used in making up as many small words as possible. Often, the materials were mimeographed, but not always. Sometimes, the children would copy the paper and pencil games to take home. The children were encouraged to bring them back the following week, but no one ever did. They talked about how various members of the family worked on these, and who was best. This idea, of sending something home with the children each week, was originally a deliberate attempt to help the coordinator-in-training offer something to the children, but became perhaps the most meaningful part of the program to the children. As curious as they were to begin the activities, they always said they wanted to save it for the week-end, and share it with the family. In fact, when first started, the activities were meant to be used at the center, but the children were told that they could take them home. Their reactions were to immediately say this is what they wanted. They had lots of things to do at the center. The need or pride, or both, in taking something home was always impressive.

The notebooks for writing were received with delight by the children but when it came to what to write, they were at a complete loss. Some copied from books, but few selected anything that they particularly liked, but would choose at random. Others made lists of what they liked. One little girl had complained bitterly about how a volunteer had cut her hair, and later said she could think of nothing to write. When encouraged to write about this, she began energetically. But three other little girls were upset by her rudeness and threatened to write about her. She quickly said that she "liked the haircut now" and proceded to write this. The older children wrote about books. The only original attempts at stories were from two boys, who wrote about ghosts, monsters, and people from outer space.

A second elementary school in the area asked about sending some children there, and the staff explained the program to the principal. The first principal had handled all contacts with the staff, but had obviously interpreted the program to his staff successfully. The original group of fifth and sixth graders was not as large as that from third and fourth grade. The children who did not respond from the first school were all in the older age group. The second school was asked to refer children for the older group, and only one teacher responded. Ten children came from this class, without homework. They were physically far larger than the fifth and sixth graders from the first school, and older. They had apparently failed at least one year in school. While the first group had averaged a year's retardation in reading, this group was all at least two years retarded by tests given at the center. They had been told by their teacher that they would ~~not~~ get individual help in reading, and that they had to attend. When the staff went again to visit the school, the teacher seemed surprised that the center was designed for homework, and explained that they never had any, but he would give some if that is what the center wanted.

The group had to be told that the center was for homework, and that they were not required to come. They continued to come for two weeks and then six dropped out. After the first week, they brought homework. They insisted in sitting at a separate table by themselves, saying that their parents did not want them to have anything to do with the children from the other school. Their school was one which had a reputation of being a "tough" school--which must have been known to the first group of children. However, the first group never said anything about not mixing with the new group, and were quite accepting of them. Gradually, the two groups did mix but not only did they have different homework, but entirely different types of work. The homework that the teacher from the second school gave, under pressure, was lists of words to be defined and used in sentences, or pages of problems that the children claimed were not their regular arithmetic work. During the second week of their attendance, they quit doing homework because they insisted that the teacher threw it in the wastepaper basket without looking at it. Rather than to go back to the school again, the volunteers used various activities available in the center and gave the children notebooks for writing. They were less able to function in groups than the children from the other school and seemed to each need an individual volunteer

The college students who came as volunteers almost invariably attached themselves to one child for the entire period, and others much less able to work with groups than were the housewives. But with the disability of the second group of children to work in groups, it was good that they had individual help.

One of the boys who left the center, of the second group, returned and became very attached to the coordinator. He seemed to be a leader in the group of his classmates, and gradually, three other boys of this group returned. When they came back, he suggested they all do their homework together, and it turned out that they were now being given regular arithmetic homework. The other boys would deny having any, and he would say "course we do" and proceed to do his. The other boys would reluctantly take theirs from their pockets or notebooks, and do it. The staff was puzzled by this boy's leadership. Although he was one of the younger boys in the group, twelve years old, he was very large and looked like a fourteen or fifteen year old. It seemed that his size made him a leader. His speech was especially childish and he became so attached to the coordinator-in-training that he came regularly and followed her about, trying to be helpful. The other boys seemed to come only because he was there, but were so basically uninterested in academic work that they became more and more disruptive. The volunteer staff found that forty-five minutes was the limit of their ability to benefit from the program, and finally accepted the idea of telling them so. They seemed able to use the center successfully for that period of time, and since snacks were served after the homework period ended, they were almost relieved to accept the suggestion that they could leave then.

Although the new director came to the settlement house and tried very hard to make the facility attractive to the study center staff, there were increasing problems due to the lack of stability of other groups who used the same facility. The coordinator-in-training felt that other staff people from other programs interfered with her work and that administrative channels were not very clear. The problems of sharing space with other groups who were changing their programs and staff became difficult.

The staff was aware that some agencies imposed fund-raising activities on groups of volunteers. This had become a problem in one middle-class center, where names of volunteers were immediately turned over to a fund-raising committee. In one case, a retired teacher came to visit a center intending to volunteer twice a week. Startled by receiving a request for a contribution, she would have left the agency without telling her real reasons except that she knew another volunteer well enough to talk over the problem with her. While McKinley House never did impose on the volunteer staff in this way, some staff members did impose on the study center paid staff to help in fund-raising, apparently assuming that this was proper. (This problem, which is often a source of complaint by volunteers is one that has never occurred with certain agencies, such as the YMCA, in our experience. Some agencies seem to have more specific guidelines about this, so that the problem never occurs.)

The only volunteer from the immediate neighborhood who joined the staff was a middle-aged Negro woman who had taught in the South for several years. Both volunteers and the children seemed to respond very well to her quiet, helpful manner. Other women in the neighborhood were recruited by the alderman's wife, but were reluctant to give academic help to children. Instead, they collected books and supplies.

The coordinator-in-training had not been able to decide about future plans to finish school. She decided, after working in this program for the semester, to work with retarded children and was helped to find a job. A citizen's group near the first school made plans to open a facility for these children, nearer the school, as a result of the good response of the children.

This center never charged an attendance fee and recruited only through the schools, with information sheets sent home for the parents to send their children with permission forms. The center had no contact with the families, but apparently the high response of the children from the first school was related to the acceptance by the parents of the school's recommendation.

By spring, a better physical facility was available for the center staff, and the volunteers from the faculty housing and the former teacher who gave two days a week felt that they would be able to build a really successful program in the new facility. The teachers reported that the main objective of the center, to help children accept responsibility for their homework, had been accomplished. While they wanted more help for their children, they felt that it could be provided by a new facility nearer to school. The coordinator-in-training was much less able to function, once she had decided that her real interest lay in work with retarded children. The staff decided to move the facility to a new location where problems of sharing facilities appeared to be much less, and where the number of available rooms made smaller groupings of children possible. The volunteers wanted to continue the

the idea of group work, and had gained valuable experience.

The children were supposed to be retested at the end of the semester. The disruption of groups and staff of other programs using the facilities caused the staff to decide to close early. While the children could, possibly, have been retested in school, the staff did not feel that the kind of group homework help given twice a week for a semester would have made a substantial difference in general reading scores. The teachers were pleased with the results of the semester help. They felt that the children's attitudes toward school and learning had improved greatly, and that the experience of successfully doing homework was important to them. Neither they, nor the staff, felt that basic disabilities in reading had been helped—or could be—without a tutoring program, which the school hoped to help develop in a site across the street from the school. Staff was available for such a center from a local poverty program. For a variety of reasons, the idea was later dropped temporarily. A year later, a new local staff member consulted with the project staff, saying that he intended to open the proposed study center. The available facility was used as a nursery school in the mornings, and for parent meetings in the evenings. Two years later, the facility was still available for afternoon use and the local board still planned to develop an afternoon program there, but was too busy with other programs to give it priority.

CHAPTER III

STABILITY OF STUDY CENTERS

In addition to the preparation of intensive case histories of the study centers which served as demonstration sites, the research design of this project called for a comparative organizational analysis of a larger sample. The objective of this type of analysis was to identify organizational and community variables which might help account for growth, stability or decline in study centers and their programs. The field work for this portion of the project was carried out by Timothy Leggett, at that time a research fellow in the Center for Social Organization Studies, University of Chicago.

In Chicago, as previously mentioned, study centers are external to the school system, and are staffed almost wholly by volunteers--by students, housewives, business and retired people. Some degree of institutionalization of these centers is obviously necessary if study centers are to achieve stability and effectiveness. In Chicago, some steps in this direction have been taken at least on the symbolic level, through the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations which through its Committee on New Residents keeps a directory of all Volunteer Tutoring Programs in the city. The directory serves as a guide to the wide variety of projects that have been established. The Commission has also held a series of city-wide conferences, to which the directors of all projects have been invited.

This chapter is based upon an interview study of a sample of these centers. Its purpose is to describe the variety of centers in program, organizational format and community orientation. It also seeks to identify factors which influence these centers' stability and institutionalization.

General Consideration

Study centers can be described as formal organizations in the sociological sense. They are organizations in which, in Blau's phrase, "Collective effort is explicitly organized for specific ends;" they are goal-achievement systems. Yet, since they are dependent wholly, or almost wholly, on volunteer staff, they are in important ways unlike other kinds of formal organization. They are therefore of special interest to the student of organization and innovation. There are enough study centers to permit comparative study, and they are all in the process of development. They therefore provide an opportunity to study the achievement of stability of innovative organizations.

Study centers are volunteer organizations that meet typically two or three times a week, bringing together disparate people for short and hectic periods of time. In some projects the volunteers do not get to know one another, so that informal work groups and informal controls are weak. Some study centers suffer from a high rate of staff turnover, and hence the frequent necessity for coordinators to make special efforts to keep the goodwill of volunteers. Centers are also necessarily affected by the qualifications of their volunteers. Community volunteers, or at least the great majority of them, have no teaching experience which would directly prepare them for tutoring work. They are qualified only for diffuse and not specific roles, and their psychological well-being is likely to be most readily secured when the demands made upon them are not too specific. The survival of study centers would therefore seem likely to depend upon either lack of role specificity for volunteers and a tolerance of their performance, or the working out of a program of training and continuing supervision.

It is evident that volunteer organizations such as study centers, which are certain to suffer from staff turnover and which are limited in their ability to be selective in recruitment, are going to have difficulties in what Selznick calls "building the institutional core" without which stability is unlikely to be achieved. These considerations suggest that, while as much attention as possible needs to be given to selective recruitment, the building of an institutional core can only be achieved by severely limiting the core of the organization to perhaps one person or by making continual and conscious efforts to establish such a core: and this process must in turn rely upon steady staff consultation and work supervision. In other words the building of an institutional core as a buttress to a study center's stability can be achieved either by one person's leadership or by the establishment of routine administrative procedures.

These are consequences that seem to follow from the use of volunteer staff in study centers. In addition there are other needs that students of formal organization have held to be common to all organizations if they are to maintain stability. Selznick and others have included, among the requisites for the "maintenance of the system" in formal organizations, continuity of policy and support for an organization from forces in its immediate environment. Both of these requirements are relevant to the case of study centers, and they are likely to be fully satisfied only if the center has both acceptance and support from its local community. A center may survive on support from sources external to the community, if this can be sustained. But even in this case some of the long-term support must come from a center's immediate neighborhood. This means that an organization supporting a center in a distant community is well advised to set about developing interest in and active support for the center's work at the grass roots. The conclusion must therefore be that in the long run local support, acceptance and legitimation are among the requisites for effective institutionalization of study centers.

Given the need for study centers to achieve stability and their tendencies toward the routinization of program and administration, the dilemma which the centers have to face is clear. The centers are likely to pursue one of two goals or a mixture of the two. They may seek an academic goal, to improve the grades of students so as to avert the danger of dropout; students may not perhaps be enabled to attain the average grades of their contemporaries, but they may be saved from falling further behind. Alternatively the centers may seek what is in effect a social goal; to give to students some confidence in relationships, that they have never before had, to prevent them from becoming outsiders to the established social system and turning against it. Or finally the centers may seek to combine these two goals. If a center becomes too effective in its routinization, it may turn into a bureaucracy which in the students' eyes is indistinguishable from school. On the other hand if it fails by too great a margin to become stable, the center faces the opposite danger of falling apart altogether, or at least of failing to keep its students interested enough to continue coming.

This consideration of goals leads directly to a hypothesized typology of study centers. It suggests a first type of center with a bureaucratic structure and a tutoring program, and a second preferring a looser structure and the promotion of sympathy and social values. Alternatively, there may not be such a clear dichotomy, in which case it may be possible to locate all centers on a continuum. These ideas about study centers emerged as the research progressed and have guided the presentation of the material. In certain respects the centers can be classified according to their program content, but in others the conception of the continuum is more appropriate.

A final question arises as to the appropriate criteria with which to evaluate the quality of study centers. There are three possible approaches. The first is to estimate by use of objective tests what progress students have made who have been tutored at study centers in specific subject matter areas. There are certainly problems to be overcome in matching these students against a control group, but these should not prove insuperable. Nevertheless, this measure does leave out of account, in the case where academic results appear to be negligible (or indeed in any case), whether there may not have been social advantages to the child in attending the center. The second approach is to study attitudes and attitude change among students at study centers. This faces the same problem of matching and others besides. Within this approach might also be included assessments of the effect of a center in developing community spirit and self-help in its neighborhood. Both of these approaches are outside the scope of this paper, and are mentioned because their development would so clearly be of the greatest value.

The third set of criteria relate to the organizational aspects of study centers. This is the set relevant to this paper. The approach uses three methods of appraisal: a measure of a center's stability (or growth), a subjective judgment of quality, and an analysis of program content and associated organizational factors. These three methods must be used together and not alone. For example, the measure of stability used on its own would be ambiguous. A center that continues to draw the same number of students (preferably the same students) up to the limits of its space and resources is as successful as one that starts its program below its potential size and scope and then expands to achieve these. In fact the stability measure is only a negative one; the centers that have not reached a target size or from which students have fallen away without replacement have in some way failed. Equally, an analysis of program content and of organization will give descriptive material and a measure of the development of routine administration, but it will not show if the coordinator has leadership qualities nor will it give anything of the "feel" of a study center, although this is undoubtedly perceived by and is important to the students who attend it.

In obtaining data about study centers for the City of Chicago there are essentially four questions to be asked: What are the different types of study centers that have developed? What are their relations with their communities? What appear to be the effects of different forms of organization upon a center, its program and its stability? What are the factors that can be identified as tending toward the institutionalization of a center?

The first section of the analysis presents the variety of study centers and brings out the range of programs offered, the differences in sponsorship, in facilities, in the level of skill of coordinators, in the supervision of staff, in sources of recruitment, and in administration. Then follows an examination of the centers' community context; how far centers are dependent on external resources and how far on grass roots, what are their links with local schools, and whether they are of local growth or the outgrowth of some externally organized project.

Third is a consideration of the effect on centers of different styles of organization. A few are institutions newly established for the one purpose, while others are old institutions that have added a tutoring project to an ongoing program. Differences between organizations can be judged, as already pointed out, not only by tests of changes in academic performance in school, but also by assessments of personal growth and by subjective evaluations of the enthusiasm and the atmosphere of a center and of the probability of a continuing stable program. Finally, an analysis is made to identify the factors that most influence the quality and continuity of a center's program and the criteria for judging whether a center is on the way to effective institutionalization.

The research was conducted through visits to study centers. Twenty were visited between November, 1964 and March, 1965, and interviews were held with each coordinator; at the same time each center was observed in action, so that an impression of its atmosphere and some direct experience of its workings could be formed. This frequently gave opportunities for discussion with volunteers other than the coordinator and for noting details of the facilities of the center. In June, 1965, the coordinators of ten of the centers were visited a second time. These ten were chosen for their representativeness of the types of center that had emerged during the first part of the research. The size of the random sample of twenty is too small to permit refined statistical treatment, but it does provide useful and suggestive material about study centers.

Population of Study Centers

In the November, 1964 directory distributed by the Mayor's Committee on New Residents, there were 130 locations listed as offering volunteer classes for elementary and high school students, and there were 65 organizations listed as sponsoring these locations. However, this information needs careful interpretation. It is not always clear when the sponsoring body plays a role of directly controlling each center and when it does not but allows autonomy to the coordinators at the specific location. The list was also found to contain some inaccuracies. Some organizations are listed twice, as are some locations, and some organizations which claim the direction of several centers turn out to run only one. In actuality there appear at that time to have been 121 distinct locations, and 75 bodies doing the work of active coordination under the aegis of 64 sponsoring organizations.

Of these 121 locations 20 were administered in part or wholly by the Roman Catholic organization, C.A.L.M. (the Chicago Area Lay Movement), 15 were run by students from Northwestern University or the University of Chicago, and the remainder had a variety of different sponsors. These included settlement houses, neighborhood clubs, churches of various denominations, parochial schools, boy's clubs, and other youth and community organizations. Considering that the situation is in a state of constant flux, by and large the Mayor's Committee list gives a quite accurate picture of the organizations involved in running study centers and of the locations actually in use.

The list also gives figures for the number of children that attend each center. These figures, which for the twenty centers visited totalled 2,055, were found for the most part to be inaccurate. The total number of students on the books of the twenty centers was estimated at approximately 1,080. On the basis of the reports of coordinators the listed figure was too high in ten cases, too low in seven cases, and correct in three. The figures can serve as a rough measure of expansion and contraction, for although they so clearly include hopes and pretentions, they also give an indication of the realism of the program organizers.

Sponsorship of Centers

The twenty centers visited had four types of organizational base. Eight were run by community organizations, such as Boys' Clubs or Settlement Houses, with paid coordinators. Five were run by ministers in their churches. Five were in institutions normally having one specific function, such as parochial schools, but now expanded to take on a study program; these were run either by regular staff or by outside volunteers. Finally, two were new organizations set up and coordinated by groups of volunteers in premises rented or loaned. Some of these programs operating in established institutions evidently owed their existence to groups of volunteers who at some point had needed the protection and stability afforded by older institutions, but these formed a sub-category rather than an additional one.

Program Content

The centers offered essentially two styles of program or a mixture of the two, although there remained scope within these for a variety of different activities. The first type of program has a distinctly academic purpose, to tutor students. The most effective way to run such a program is to ensure tutoring on a one-to-one basis, but there are centers with what are clearly tutoring programs which cannot maintain this teaching ratio. It is the content of what is taught, and not the achievement of a one-to-one ratio, which determines whether or not a program is a tutoring program. Where the program sets out to teach the students specific subject matter, reading and mathematics being the most common, then it is a tutoring program.

The second type of program offered what can be called "social education." This type of center does not attempt to give students out-of-school teaching, but rather the help, attention and understanding of an interested adult on a continuing basis. Volunteers may give help to students with their homework, or they may ask a student to suggest what he or she wishes to do. In these cases each volunteer has a group of children to look after, or at least two; the choice has to be made between setting each child an individual task or trying to keep the attention of all the group together. Sometimes the program is even less structured than this; it may provide library facilities or games for the children who have finished their homework or who have none to do. In the final analysis the only formal object of these latter programs is to give very deprived children an adult with whom to have a steady relationship. Although this object was sometimes the sole aim of a program, it was in fact one of the aims of all the twenty centers visited. Whatever else it was hoped to do, however structured the program, this theme constantly recurred as part of the philosophy of each program. It was believed that there is something to be gained by every disadvantaged child having a good relationship with a concerned and interested young or older adult.

Of the twenty centers visited, three were of the first type--offering structured programs of tutoring--fifteen were of the second type, and two were of a mixed type--offering tutoring to some students, homework help to others and library facilities to all.

Coordinators and Volunteers

The centers are also distinguished from each other, beyond their sponsorship and program content, by style of coordination and by the type of coordinator chosen to run programs. Five of the centers visited had a system of dual control; in these cases authority was either directly divided or, even if one person was responsible for the overall administration of the program, another had a clear supervisory function distinct from that of any other member of the staff. The remaining fifteen centers were run by a single coordinator.

The coordinators differed in background and experience. There were six centers with at least one coordinator who possessed professional training, either in teaching or in social work; all of these coordinators were women. A further eight centers were run by persons whose relevant experience was that of working over a period of time in a community organization; this category included church ministers. The remaining six coordinators had had no previous relevant experience. Twelve of the twenty centers paid their coordinators; the remainder did not. All but one of the coordinators with some professional background were paid, but not at a higher rate than other coordinators. There is no such thing as a professional coordinator, and therefore no rate of payment at the level of professional salaries.

Sources of recruitment of volunteers varied, and many centers used more than one source, as the following table indicates:-

Personal contact	8
College or high school group	17
External church group	3
Bell Telephone Co.	2
Volunteer Bureau or advertising	2
Total	32

The table shows that the centers relied heavily on students. One center drew its volunteers exclusively from a teachers' college and these, therefore, had some training in teaching. Ten relied solely on college and high school students. Eight supplemented these with older adults. Only one of the twenty had no student volunteers, using older adults exclusively. There is a far higher rate of turnover of student volunteers than of others, but it is clear that centers cannot obtain the numbers of volunteers that they need without the help of students.

The type of supervision of volunteers varied considerably. At ten centers there was none at all. At three an introductory talk was given to new volunteers about the local community and about the problems of tutoring, at four there were periodic evaluations of the work, and at three centers experienced teachers supervised the volunteers' work at weekly or two weekly intervals. The amount of supervision was not affected, as had seemed plausible, by whether or not the coordinaters was paid. Half of the twelve centers with paid coordinators had some kind of volunteer training or supervision, and half did not; the same was true of the centers with unpaid coordinators.

The centers also differed in other respects; in library facilities, in record-keeping, in number of sessions per week, and in the system whereby students were referred to the center. Seven had take-home library books, while four had books for use at the center, and the remaining nine had nothing that merited the title "library." The nucleus of any library always consisted in a number of books for work in reading or math and some reference books. These were often supplemented with school readers. The better equipped libraries also had extensive additional reading of a kind that students were not likely to come across in school, and more material in the way of encyclopaedias and the like. Six centers maintained regular records of students' problems and progress, which were kept up by the volunteers either after each session or on a weekly basis; four had the same intention not yet fulfilled and the remaining ten had neither records nor aspirations. To twelve centers students were referred by their schools, to four they were referred by the institutions housing the study center and to eight students were self-referred; in three centers more than one method was in use. Some centers are content to rely upon school referral and some wish not to do so, according to their convictions about what students they are trying to reach. However, it does seem likely that all centers would prefer to have a proportion of their students referred by neighboring schools. Whether a center does or does not have some students referred by schools is one indication of the extent to which it has become institutionalized.

This list of characteristics gives but a skeleton description of the centers. When visited they are full of life. A center of the first type, with a clear tutoring program, may strike the visitor in the following way. Within a large institutional building it occupies a spacious, well-lit room. It has fifteen small tables with chairs at each for one tutor and one student at a time, and two larger tables with more chairs, at which more tutor-student pairs may sit without being in each others' way. In one corner is a rather disorganized library, and this is conspicuous in view of the general orderliness of all other goings on in the place, which has a dedicated, silent, scheduled atmosphere. Each student comes at a specific time appointment, and each tutor has two students each day. This is the real work, and so the library is not an integral part of the facilities; it is more of an additional service. No child can wander in casually. He comes because he needs to; his elders say so, or he wants to get on. In any event there is a strong motivation. The coordinator, a trained social worker, is kind and friendly, but is seemingly much of the time busy in an office down the corridor. The tutors, all local housewives, seem attentive and keen. The most lasting impression is of the purposefulness of this center, which ignores any activity not immediately consonant with its one-to-one tutoring program. In this place there is at least some danger of the atmosphere coinciding with that of a school.

A center of the second type, offering "social education," is very different. It is perhaps located in a church hall; in fact it overflows into the church itself. At the start of the session there is a great babel of sound from a crowd of children of all ages. And from the volunteers also, most of whom come in from a suburb of Chicago; they bring their sons and daughters to help with the students. The coordinator is a large, bluff pastor, who greets everyone with infectious bonhomie, as he or she, adult or child, enters the hall. Then, miraculously, the milling group sorts itself into pairs of small groups of people, at the long tables in the hall or along the pews of the church. Everyone is busy. The children ask their questions or are given math or reading to do or are occupied with games. The pastor moves about seeing that each group is settled and where he can sit with a child in need of extra help. There is always some doubt as to which students and indeed which volunteers will show up, but the zest and spirit of the place and the personality of the pastor ensure that it is a going concern, that the effort and goodwill will be maintained and that good numbers of children and adults will always come to the center, whatever the weather.

Community Context

Study centers have developed in local communities of Chicago with widely different characteristics, and not only in those areas that are obviously depressed. They have also sprung up in relatively prosperous communities. For the purposes of this study, a depressed community is one where more than 25 per cent of the families earn less than $3,000 a year, more than 20 per cent of the adults are receiving public assistance, more than 30 per cent of boys aged 15-19 are delinquent, more than ten per cent of the population of working age is unemployed, and more than 30 per cent of the housing is substandard. There were five centers in the sample in such areas. At the other extreme a community will be called prosperous in which fewer than 15 per cent of the families are earning below $3,000 a year, less than five per cent of the adults population is on public assistance, fewer than 15 per cent of the boys aged 15-19 are delinquent, fewer than five per cent of the population of working age is unemployed, and less than 15 per cent of the housing is substandard. These rates are for communities in which there is a range of wellbeing. The overall rates should not conceal the fact that there are pockets of poverty within areas of relative affluence. Four of the centers visited were in such areas. The very neediest areas were those of heavy Negro concentration, in which more than 50 per cent of the population was Negro. In other areas there were large numbers of foreign language-speakers, of Puerto Rican, Mexican, or Polish origin; frequently in these cases the adult family members do not speak English.

In respect of their community connections there are basically three types of centers; those that are indigenous in origin and have some local resources, those that are indigenous but wholly dependent upon support from outside the community, and those that originated and continue to be supported from the outside. In the sample of twenty centers, only eight reported locally recruited volunteers, while the remaining twelve were staffed by volunteers from outside the community. It is important to note that not a single one of the twenty was being run without some volunteers from outside the community.

It might be thought almost impossible for a study center to function without establishing good relations with the schools in its neighborhood. However, of the twenty centers seven had no liaison of any kind with local schools, and one had good relations with only one of the three schools in its area. In none of the centers were parents involved to any extent in center activities, and only in a few was there any effort being made in this direction. In these, mothers were asked to prepare cake or cookies, to act as hostesses of some sort, or to help with library books. The amount of contact between centers and other community organizations depended on their sponsorship. A center located in an institution (e.g., a settlement house) which was closely connected with other community organizations would itself benefit from these. Centers not in this position were much less likely to have links with other organizations.

Associated Characteristics

The most important distinguishing characteristic of the centers has been shown to be program content. If the twenty centers visited are divided according to this criterion, according to whether their programs are tutoring programs or of a mixed type or by contrast for social education only, it will be seen that there are associations between type of program and other characteristics that differentiate the centers. It is from these associations that a pattern of institutionalization emerges.

The associations are seen most clearly when set out in the form of a table, as follows:-

	Type of Program			
	I Tutoring or Mixed (n=5)		II Social Education Only (N-15)	
Characteristics	no.	%	no.	%
More than three weekly sessions	3	(60)	2	(13)
Paid coordinator	4	(80)	8	(53)
Coordinator with skills	4	(80)	2	(13)
Local volunteers	5	(100)	2	(13)
Non-student volunteers	4	(80)	5	(33)
Recruitment by personal contact	4	(80)	4	(26)
Supervision/evaluation sessions	5	(100)	2	(13)
School referral	4	(80)	8	(53)
Good school relations	4	(80)	8	(53)
Records maintained	5	(100)	1	(7)
Take-home library	4	(80)	3	(20)

Note: (I) percentages are given to make the proportions more easily perceived.

(II) there were three tutoring programs and two of mixed type.

These results are easy enough to interpret. It is clear that tutoring or mixed programs are associated with much more administration than are those of social education, and that their tendency is toward routinized administration and at least the trappings of management; they are stronger on record-keeping, library service, and liasion with the schools. The centers with programs of social education had more diffuse administration. The only center that had a tutoring program and did not claim good relations with schools did in fact have good relations with one out of three neighboring schools. The seven centers with social education programs that lacked good school relations had no relations of any kind with schools.

The association of tutoring and mixed programs with coordinators with some professional training in teaching or social work seems to imply either that these programs call for the employment of coordinators with special skills or that skilled coordinators tend to set up more structured programs than those without skills. In fact the latter is the correct explanation. In each of the four tutoring or mixed programs with a skilled coordinator the coordinator was present at the initiation of the project and the devising of the program. By contrast, in the case of the two social education programs with a professional as coordinator one coordinator was hired (by a non-professional superior) after the program had been set up, and the other (a teacher) was elderly and long since retired. A coordinator's level of skill was also of more importance than whether or not she was paid. There was one trained teacher who was not paid for her coordinating work. However, she was a minister's wife who gave her services free to a study center set up in her husband's church. In other words she was the only professional whom it was not necessary to hire.

In regard to the supervision of volunteers, three of the tutoring or mixed programs included systems of regular supervision, and two had periodic sessions of evaluation of work. Among the fifteen social education programs only two included any evaluation system, three had orientation sessions at the start of the program and ten had no kind of supervision of volunteers at all. The centers of the first type used more sources of recruitment all told; the five centers used twelve sources, while the fifteen centers of the second type used only twenty-three sources. Ten of these centers used only student volunteers, while only one of the centers with tutoring programs did so. As it happens, this one center was a special case. Its volunteers were, all students from a teachers' college; all therefore had professional training relevant to tutoring.

The centers with tutoring programs had better relations with their communities. They had better liaison with neighboring schools and they drew more volunteers from their localities than did centers with no tutoring. This could very well be due to the communities' different levels of prosperity. The relationship between community prosperity and program content is therefore set out in the following table:-

	Type of program		
Community prosperity	Tutoring or mixed	Social education only	total
Prosperous	2	2	4
Respectable*	2	9	11
Depressed	1	4	5
Total	5	15	20

*communities that are outside the definitions of prosperous or depressed are "respectable."

Three of the sixteen centers outside prosperous communities had run a tutoring program, as compared with two out of the four in prosperous areas. This suggests that if a center is not in a prosperous neighborhood then it is more likely than not, by thirteen cases to three, to run a program of social education only. It is certain that better off communities are more active in the solution of social problems and are more likely to support the activities of a study center. They are also more likely to be able to produce the resources of a skilled person in filling the role of study center coordinator. However, the exceptions have to be explained. Not only do some prosperous neighborhoods have centers with programs with no tutoring, but there are study centers in depressed areas that have overcome the apparent disadvantages of their community setting and established tutoring programs. The explanation of this finding is not evidently related to two other factors, whether or not there are local volunteers and whether or not all volunteers are high school or college students. Three of the four centers in prosperous communities had some local volunteers, while in all other areas only three out of sixteen did so. The same three out of four centers had some volunteers other than students; in contrast to the five out of the sixteen elsewhere in the same position. The odd center out of the four did not provide any tutoring. At the same time four of the tutoring programs had some adult volunteers, while the fifth had teachers in training; and all five had volunteers resident in the community.

What therefore emerges is two propositions. First, prosperous areas are more likely to find local adult volunteers. From this it follows that non-prosperous areas are more likely to rely on student volunteers from outside the community. Indeed, as might be expected, outside students are most likely to penetrate the non-prosperous areas, which are presumed to be those most in need of help. Second, tutoring programs are not established without the support of local adult volunteers. The corollary of this is that where there is local support it may be possible to run a tutoring program, but where a center has been set up by student volunteers from outside the community there is virtually no likelihood of such a program. It is of great importance to note the circumstances in which tutoring programs have been established in centers in non-prosperous localities. One center was staffed, as already mentioned, by teachers' college students, one was in a slum area but was able to attract volunteers from an adjoining prosperous sector of that area, and the third was in a community greatly activated by the Northwest Community Organization.

Measures of Stability

An Objective Measure: The next step is to examine which characteristics of study centers are linked to growth or contraction during the period of the study. Of the centers visited none with a tutoring program had contracted, indeed four of the five had grown. That is to say, one equalled and four exceeded the number of students given for each center in the Mayor's Committee list. In contrast only five of the fifteen centers with programs of social education had maintained their numbers, and of these only two claimed to have grown. The characteristics related to stability are the following: the type of supervision given to volunteers; the type of volunteers recruited; the level of skill of the coordinator; and the level of prosperity of the community setting. The relationships are shown in the following table:-

		Stability			
		growing	stable	contracting	total
Type of Super-vision	(supervision	3	0	0	3
	(evaluation	1	2	1	4
	(orientation	1	0	2	3
	(nil	2	1	7	10
Coordin-ator's Experience	(professional	3	2	1	6
	(community organi-zation	2	1	5	8
	(none	2	0	4	6
Type of	(students only	2	1	7	10
	(some volunteer (non-student	5	2	3	10
Community level of Prosperity	(prosperous	2	1	1	4
	(respectable	4	1	6	11
	(depressed	1	1	3	5

Note: the measure of stability is reached by a comparison of the number of students given by the coordinator with the figure in the Mayor's Committee list.

The table shows that all centers with continual supervision had expanded and that only one of the seven centers with either supervision or periodic evaluations had actually contracted; seven of the ten centers lacking any system of supervision had shrunk since their formation.

In regard to types of volunteer, seven of the ten centers wholly dependent on student volunteers, none of which ran tutoring programs, had contracted. Of the remaining ten centers only three had contracted. Nine out of fourteen centers with unskilled coordinators had contracted, while only one out of six with a professional as coordinator had done so. Finally, there seems to be a relationship between community prosperity and stability. Only one of five study centers in depressed areas (as previously defined) could claim growth, and only one of the seven that had grown was in a depressed area.

It is now apparent that there is a connection between program content, a coordinator's skill, systems of supervision, evidence of community ties, a community's level of prosperity, and a center's stability. However, the directions of the relationships are not yet clear. Among these factors, type of supervision, skill of coordinator, and type of volunteer recruited, the skill of the coordinator seems to be of principal importance since it is usually the coordinator's function to recruit and supervise volunteers. This is corroborated by the fact that only one of the six centers with a skilled coordinator was reliant solely upon college and high school students for its volunteers and that nine of the ten centers which depended upon students had no supervision of volunteers at all. It seems that program content, number of sessions per week and the general competence of the administration (as implied by library facilities, record-keeping, and system of supervision) are similarly dependent on the expertise of the coordinator. However, these qualities of centers still vary when the coordinator's skills are held constant. The analysis has shown that the other main factor affecting these variables is the extent of the center's community ties. If recruitment is local and through personal contact, this will affect not only the type of volunteer recruited but also the number of times a week that sessions are held.

Subjective Judgment: The second method of appraising centers is by subjective judgment of its spirit and atmosphere and of the purposiveness and zest of its staff. This provides the only method, at least over a short period of inquiry, of gauging to what extent a center is a going concern, how dynamic it is, how responsive (occasionally how noisy) the children, how zestful and confident the volunteers, how effective the leadership.

When the twenty centers visited are considered in terms of all three methods of appraisal, seven stand out according to the subjective assessment. These seven turn out to be among the ten that have not contracted, and five of them are the five with tutoring programs. These five, it will be recalled, had one-to-one tutoring, volunteers from diverse sources, records that were kept up, and either supervision of or evaluation sessions for volunteers; four of the five had a coordinator with professional training, a library with take-home facilities, recruitment of volunteers by personal contact and from the local community, and good liaison with local schools. This is strong confirmation of the appropriateness of the subjective judgment, but it does leave the question of what were the characteristics of the two other centers also chosen by this criterion which ran programs of social education.

Let these two centers be designated Center A and Center B. Both centers were run by churches. Center A had good community relations, a range of volunteers, and evaluation sessions; it did not have a tutoring program, a coordinator with professional skills, records of work or a take-home library. In other words, it appeared to have achieved the support of the community, and to have put its efforts into a program of homework help and social education. It is therefore a good example of a stable center with a social education program. Center B was apparently less well off. It has no skilled coordinator, structured program, supervision of volunteers, library facilities; it had no volunteers from the community and no liaison with local schools. It did, however, recruit its volunteers through personal contact and recruit them from varied (mainly non-student) sources, and it did keep records of students' progress. What was most conspicuous about Center B was the responsiveness of volunteers and students, and the considerable enthusiasm with which its program was carried on. This is a center that was beginning to put down roots in what is close to being a depressed area, but, like Center A, was not attempting more than homework and social education. It seems certain to last. This analysis shows how the stability achieved by a program of social education is of a different kind from that achieved by tutoring or mixed programs.

Conclusions

These data help to identify those factors that determine the achievement of a center's successful institutionalization. For this purpose institutionalization is defined as the ability of a center to endure through time and to provide a program that does not diminish in size and scope and that is not dependent upon the leadership of a particular coordinator. More specifically this means that institutionalization encompasses staff recruitment, the program, and coordinating and supervisory procedures. These are the minimum elements for achieving institutionalization. They supply a basis for classifying this sample of study centers in terms of their relative stability.

The first type of center is one that runs a tutoring program. It has a quite specific goal, to improve the school grades of its students. It usually achieves, although this does not seem indispensable, a one-to-one tutor-student ratio. This type of center requires a competent administrator, and more often than not it has as coordinator a person of some professional skills, either a teacher or a social worker. Such a person can train and supervise, and listen to volunteers' problems, as well as have a near-professional authority or bureaucratic skills. A tutoring program demands a range of volunteers, for although student volunteers have a part to play they cannot, owing to the requirements of their own academic work, guarantee absolute regularity of attendance as can older volunteers; and a tutoring program requires that each child should, so far as is possible, always be taught by the same tutor. This need for regular, adult volunteers and minimal staff turnover in turn requires the tutoring center to have good community support and the opportunity to recruit tutors through direct personal contact. The structured program further requires that the tutors be supervised and guided to the extent that the resources available to the center allow, and it implies that records of each student be kept so that progress of tutoring can be gauged and so that unavoidable changes in tutors can be made as smoothly as possible. Since the number of children who can be tutored at any one time is limited in such a program, the tutoring center will often make up for this shortcoming by scheduling more sessions in the week than other centers do; this also demands a large pool of tutors upon whom to draw. This first type of center, in short, has a tutoring program that is successfully institutionalized.

The second type of center is one that runs a program of social education as well as a tutoring program; its program is of the mixed type. It is only different from the first type in that its undertaking is more complex. It provides, in addition to all else, a library service and reference books and either space alone or help also for students who bring their homework to do. Although from one viewpoint such a program is more ambitious than that of the first type of center described, its additional services can often be a source of strength. For example, such a center can remain open through the summer, and thereby give its work continuity, merely by making its library service continually available.

The third type of center runs a program of social education, which no doubt includes homework help, and is successfully instituionalized. It does provide close supervision of students in a regular way. It has the support of adult volunteers, it has steady numbers of volunteers and students, and it is struggling to acquire community support and interest. The fourth type of center also has a program entirely of social education but is almost wholly dependent for its volunteers upon sources outside the community. The majority of the volunteers are students and many of them are somewhat irregular in their attendance; they are not supervised, and do not keep records. The staff turnover is high. This type of center is often of quite modest size, and its local support is deficient. Its stability is uncertain.

The fifth type of center may attempt a program of social education but it is inadequately organized. Its aims are not formulated. It does not have a regular supply of volunteers and its students also fluctuate. It has no competent administrator, and often poor premises. It tends to be sponsored by some sort of community organization. This leads to the implication that some of these centers are set up as a "front," as the fashionable thing to do, without regard to the effort and cost of setting up a program on a stable basis.

Only the first two types of centers described can be said to be successfully institutionalized. The characteristics of these centers should therefore be recapitulated, but this time as factors that determine a center's institutionalization. To achieve this a center must have a clearly seen goal and a program, whether for academic or for social education, that allows reasonably close supervision for each child (although a precise volunteer-student ratio does not appear to matter). If the program is more flexible than this, it will become too loose and indeterminate to afford stability. Second, a center needs adult volunteers. They are more likely than students to live in the neighborhood and to be regular in their attendance once they have made a commitment. Third, and this is closely related, the center must achieve support from its community. It needs good relations with schools, with other local organizations, and where possible with parents, as well as the greater stability that comes from having volunteer help that is local. All of this gives a center and its workers the sense of belonging in the community in which they are placed.

Beyond this there is some scope for variation. A center does require a certain measure of competence in administration for institutionalization to occur. Evidently this may be, and sometimes is, achieved by a vigorous amateur, who keeps an informal but effective grip on the running of the center and is responded to by his volunteers. A surer way, however, is for a center to employ a coordinator with training for a relevant profession, such as teaching or social work, who as part of his (or more frequently her) job should keep proper records of the students and their work and attendance and should establish a system of consultation with and supervision of volunteers. Such a center achieves a routine of administration. A special subclass of institutionalized centers has a system of dual control, and in these cases one of the two senior persons has some form of professional expertise.

CHAPTER IV

CHILDREN OF THE STUDY CENTERS

On the basis of observations, group discussions and written reports of the staff, volunteers and principal investigator, it was possible to assemble a range of anecdotal and descriptive materials about the problems, attitudes and outlook of the children who were served by the demonstration programs. Centering around eight descriptive headings, much revealing material was discovered.

Comprehension

The problems of underachieving children appear to lie overwhelmingly in their lack of comprehension and absence of experience which would strengthen comprehension in reading, arithmetic or any other school subject. Reading is a mechanical process of pronouncing words, and volunteers were continually startled when they realized that so much of the reading had no meaning to the children. The same children who read mechanically, without thought, often wanted workbooks. Here again, they could often explain to the volunteers "what was wanted" and could complete the exercises successfully, without understanding the material at all. When questions or discussions did not fit into a recognizable pattern, the children were lost.

A group of older children were studying for a special examination on the constitution and had memorized the right answers.

They could explain none of the phrases they recited so readily. When explanations were offered, the children tried to memorize them verbatim. Except for memorizing, they seemed unable to know what to do with any material that was offered.

In arithmetic, children had memorized some facts of arithmetic. Many in the upper grades counted with their fingers. One ten year old girl asked a staff person to come over and put out her hands. She needed more fingers to solve her arithmetic problems. When problems were written, it was not only the reading that baffled them, but the fact that they had very limited ability to decide which process to use to solve a problem. If told to add, they could at least make an attempt. The processes of arithmetic were very compartmentalized--"we do multiplication this week."

Also startling to volunteers was the childrens' inability to do jigsaw puzzles. As a result of this disability, both Welles-Darrow and North Park used a variety of puzzles, periodically replacing them with new ones. Old ones were put away for a time or exchanged with another center. Even the brightest children followed the pattern of indiscriminately trying pieces until one fit. Hardly ever did they look at the shapes, or the outlines, unless taught to do so. The most common puzzle was a map of the United States, with the pieces cut according to the shape of the states and the outline of every state clearly visible on the board. Most of the children were unaware of how to begin and indiscriminately tried pieces until one fit. Left alone, they memorized where the pieces went, just as they memorized most of what they learned.

The privacy of the study centers allowed the children to express themselves more often about what they did not understand in school. The common complaint that "the teacher didn't explain" something could best be answered by showing the child his own textbook explanations. The fact that adults have to study explanations before they can understand the work always impressed the children. From their remarks, volunteers often were left wondering how much of school and life is incomprehensible to them. A child complained that he missed a spelling word. The word the teacher said was "something." Was that the same word as "somethin," a word he knew? It was not what the child did not understand in school that worried the volunteers. They were often made aware that the child did not understand the work they did at the study center. Because of the intimacy of working with one child, they were in a better position to see more of this lack of understanding, and the children gradually became more able to ask for explanations, or to reveal the utter lack of understanding of their work.

A girl was working with a page of words such as "hop" and "hope," to understand what happened to the vowel sound when a final "e" was added. She pronounced the words correctly, but suddenly in the middle of the page, became very excited about the word "dime" which followed "dim." She said "that's dime--that's a real word--I know what it is." The volunteer wondered, of course, what the rest of the words were, if this one was real and recognizable.

All volunteers became aware of the lack of background of the children and the simple kinds of information about the world that were not part of their experience. Not all were equally good at finding out, because if they put the child on the spot by saying "Do you like to read newspapers?" he would obviously be forced to answer "no." To protect himself, he would claim no interest in them. When volunteers, instead, simply introduced a newspaper and talked about it, and read it with them, the children often later confided that it was the "first time they ever read a paper." The same was true of crossword puzzles, which could be used most successfully, but only if the volunteer did not spoil it by assuming that "everyone, of course, knows what a crossword puzzle is."

Even very sensitive volunteers made mistakes, but the fact that they found out later, from the children's comments, was important. Whether the children are as apt to admit their lack of knowledge in a class room is doubtful, but certainly sensitive teachers must continually have the same experience. A group of children who were predominately from the top track in fifth grade and had been members of a reading club for several weeks, listened with rapt attention to a story about a bridge. They later discussed the story, and only after several minutes of discussion did one child timidly ask "what is a bridge?" The other children looked up expectantly, and not one of them could explain what a bridge was, but they all wanted to know. The volunteer felt that she had failed because she had assumed either that they knew or that they knew her well enough to ask. The important fact was that they did ask, and that volunteers who have such experiences are more aware of the kinds of mistakes that even a sensitive and thoughtful adult can make. If in this small group, where questions had been solicited and encouraged, the children still hesitated so long in asking for an explanation, what must they do everyday in less benign settings?

Both the control group and the children in centers tested by the staff showed consistently low scores in comprehension. These tests also involved following specific instructions, which they found difficult. Any time that words were used in sentences which had to be understood in order to give the right answers, the scores were low. Testing for speed usually produced the best score, especially when accuracy was not considered. After speed came vocabulary (isolated words, on which they did consistently better than in comprehension whether or not pictures were offered with the words), and the lowest score was, in more than half of the cases, in comprehension.

In only isolated instances did the wrong answers given make sense, although incorrect on the basis of the material presented. These were consistent in certain paragraphs which could be answered with different available words. Brighter children made such errors, and seemed to understand that, regardless of what might make sense, the right answers were arbitrary on the basis of only the material presented. Usually, incorrect answers made no sense at all and the children seemed unaware of this until they read their choices aloud. It was not a case of misunderstanding the directions, because they would start out giving correct answers and then apparently stumble and resort to wild guesses. Aloud, they would often find that they could make enough sense of the paragraph to make reasonable answers even without being able to read every word. But for the majority of the children, reading words or reading rapidly was far easier than even simple paragraphs that required understanding.

From the literature and the students' widespread concern with "vocabulary," we had expected to find lower vocabulary scores. Many children reported "I need my vocabulary increased," or mothers brought them to the center saying "He needs his vocabulary increased." These were the only specific kinds of help that parents and children asked for. But only in one center, with Spanish speaking children, was vocabulary the main problem of three fourths of the children. While scores of study center children were generally low, comprehension, not vocabulary, was consistently and uniformly low.

The concern with "vocabulary" for these children has become so widespread that several projects list "vocabulary building" as their only goal. Our evidence seemed to continually demonstrate that the children were much more able to define isolated words than they were to understand even simpler words in the context of sentences or paragraphs. To "use" their language was a much greater problem.

But of course, vocabulary was also low, because their reading scores were generally low. The kind of mechanical drill that they do so much of in spelling, or looking up words in the dictionary and writing sentences based on the dictionary definition--sentences that make no sense--does not seem to help. Their greater need seemed to be for exposure to material to read that was easy enough for them to master. From reading any material that appealed to them, their reading generally improved. Most of their problems were with comprehension, a less number with vocabulary, and a few had significantly low speed scores. Whatever the problem, the best help seemed to be practice in reading that was easy enough to be rewarding. This is what they had never had. Limited to required readers in school, they had never reinforced what they knew, but had gone on to harder materials until they were defeated.

The inaccessibility of public libraries seemed obvious. Only after a child had been introduced to a wide variety of books and had some idea what to ask for would he even go near one and, even then, never without a volunteer. School libraries are apparently often not available to children in the lower grades, when they most need them. And even in middle-class communities, it is not unusual for the children to enter the school library with their hands on their heads.

Speech

Another very obvious characteristic of the children was their uniformly bad grammar. The children from the poorest families seemed to have the worst speech and were criticized and sometimes corrected by the others. The other children would tell them "be quiet" on trips, because they talked so badly. The most common problem reported by volunteers was leaving off all endings of words. Only simple verb forms were used, and all endings such as "ed" and "ing" were not pronounced. The children also consistently mixed singular nouns with plural verbs and vice versa. Double negatives and running together of words were evident in the very worst speech.

Generally, the children did not react adversely to correction, but most volunteers began to correct their speech only after they knew them for several weeks. The only adverse reactions reported were when volunteers corrected the children's writings. One boy wrote "yesterday, I eat . . ." and insisted that "ate" was not a word because he had never heard it. Another insisted on using "stop" instead of "stopped."It sounded better to him and "it's my story."

A group of ten children in a summer reading club listened to examples of tall tales and decided to compose their own for presentation the next day. They would dictate them into a tape recorder. It was suggested that they each compose one that could be told in about two minutes. Not realizing how long two minutes are, they all made up one sentence tall tales. "I have only one teeth." "The teachers here is all skeletons." The volunteers waited in vain for one child to use a sentence with corresponding subject and verb. Not one of the ten did. Later, they tried hard to use correct forms, and one child proudly composed the sentence, "We have lots of fruits." (The group also timed their speaches with a stop watch and were startled to find out how "long a minute is." Only one child would attempt talking for a whole minute and gave up after thirty seconds.)

Whether volunteers worked with children individually or in groups, the emphasis was always on participation and therefore speech by the children. Activities which emphasized speech were individually reading aloud, taking turns reading with a volunteer, and discussing what was read. Children often independently memorized poems they liked and recited them to volunteers. Group reading of poetry and simple dramatic activities were especially enjoyed by groups of all ages.

The children often expressed interest in how people talk. They would observe other children and adults and then startle the volunteers by saying "she talk good" or "he talk awful." When several foreign visitors came to one center, one each week over a period of five weeks, the children were most critical of some of them because of their speech. They seemed unable to accept the fact that these people could be intelligent, when their English was not good. They were interested in talking about the visitors and what they had learned about the countries, but insisted on judging their intelligence only by their command of the English language, which varied from very good to one which was very limited.

Although a few of the brightest children began to correct themselves, and very often interpreted for those with the worst speech, this remains the area in which no one really helped these children. The most capable youngsters we had made the greatest academic gains, and these gains could be reflected on every part of the reading tests. Their speech remains an obvious handicap. Interestingly enough, many of the mothers of the "top track" children at the housing project used better grammar than did their children. Several were in college, and others in job training. The speech of both teachers and parents varies, but has many of the same kinds of grammatical errors the children have. The problem of accent seemed unimportant.

Despite the concern of study center staffs with the poor speech of the children, few formal attempts were made to present grammar rules or explanations to groups of children. Individual children were corrected, and the children would repeat the correct form of the word or sentence. They would listen politely to explanations, and usually nod their heads as if they understood. In the summer group program, only the staff people who were there every day corrected the children. In both centers, the brighter children began to correct their own worst errors and occasionally corrected other children.

Individual volunteers often reported that the speech of their students improved. Certainly, the children did talk more, and more often in sentences, as they became more comfortable with the volunteers. The initial inhibition on speech was obvious; new children at the centers, whether for tutoring or homework help, tended to speak in very short, incomplete sentences. The disability was exaggerated by the tendency to speak very softly, and look at the floor. Several children showed a physical inhibition to speech by putting a hand over their mouths. As the volunteers got to know the children, they would say "I want to understand you. Can you think of any way that would help me to hear you better?" The children invariably answered "you mean this?" and dropped the hand to their side. New children were often reported to speak "only with their eyes." They watched and waited, and only slowly and hesitantly began to talk. Their inhibitions about speaking were obvious and extreme.

Despite the continued efforts of volunteers to understand the children, it remained a problem for many adults. It required concentration and effort and, despite their efforts, they often had to ask children to repeat themselves. "I'm sorry, I didn't understand you and I want to. Please speak louder," or "please tell me again" were fairly common responses from adults. A few children of the volunteers visited the center during the school term and summer session. These children of eight to twelve years of age, white middle-class children, were often more able to understand the children than were the adults who knew them better.

Many children were at first so inhibited that the volunteers were pleased when they would talk at all. The adults also got used to the speech patterns, and learned to understand the children better. On several occasions, coordinators or volunteers would comment about a child's "good speech." This would be one of the children who did not use double negatives, who spoke distinctly, and who sometimes helped other children with the worst errors. But when anyone not involved in the project heard these children talk, they were appalled and would ask if anything at all was done to help them. Only their speech now sets the most capable children from the study centers apart from their contemporaries--but that is a definite, immediately obvious handicap that remains basically unchanged. Roger, a boy at North Park who was headed for college even before he came to the study center, is the only child in North Park and Welles-Darrow whose speech is not a handicap. His good speech makes him a deviate in his neighborhood. The speech of most other children will make them stand out in any setting outside of their present neighborhoods.

It seems obvious that the children's speech is limited by that of their contemporaries, since several of the mothers spoke with obviously good grammar and this seemed to have no effect on their children's speech. We can assume that they also hear a good deal of good grammar in school. If it is true that children speak as their friends do, the only real hope for overcoming this handicap is integration with middle-class children in schools. Many of our children have every other middle-class trait except speech. The only comparable group the project director has ever seen was in a slum school in England, where top track children of obviously superior intelligence used Cockney grammar and accent exclusively. Their teacher of eight months, a very impressive young man with excellent speech, lead them in very thoughtful discussions during class. School authorities agreed that these twelve-year olds were uniformly handicapped by speech which would make their entry into the labor market most difficult. The experience had been repeated for many years, and the school used a variety of speech activities during school hours, but with no dramatic results. Since no child in the room spoke without Cockney accent and grammar, the children heard only adults speak in any other way.

Stealing

There was very little stealing in the centers, because of the number of adults in constant contact with the children and the natural carefulness of the children. They have learned well to not leave money around, and were quick to remind staff people about their purses. Many refused to remove their coats or sweaters for a long time, until they felt sure that they would not be stolen.

In the housing project, there were two instances during the first summer. One child took several dozen pencils under his jacket and walked around very obviously defying the staff to do something about it; they simply told him to put them back. Another child, on another day, put fifteen pairs of small sissors under her jacket. As she started to leave, they began to fall from her jacket, and a staff person walked over and asked her to open her jacket and helped her put them back into the cupboard. The loss would have been discovered the next morning when classes met.

In the case of these two instances, there was no follow-up and no discussion with the children involved. The volunteers did not know what to do, and the project coordinator decided to ignore the incidents. When the project director returned from vacation, reports came from the volunteers that the children "stole everything in sight." This impression was based on the two incidents. An inventory made of the supplies tallied so closely with the original inventory that it seemed that the loss that had occurred was less than would be reasonably expected. The only complaint that could have been made about the first summer session was the ignoring of this behavior. Besides what it meant to the children to be ignored, the reaction of the volunteers was unfortunate in thinking, because of two incidents, that these children stole "as a way of life." They were reassured after the inventory was made.

This first incident with two children was only the beginning of such problems with staff people that occurred during the several years that the project was observing centers. No other reluctantance can be as powerful as the reluctance of both professionals and nonprofessionals to discuss a child's stealing with him. Other children in the centers always reported the incidents, or identified the child. While there were not many incidents in the years studied, it is obviously one of the hardest jobs for anyone working with children to handle. From talks with teachers, too, it appears that a great deal of such behavior is ignored, because the adult simply does not know what to say or do. The project staff felt this was unacceptable. The same adult who will become very upset about profanity or fighting will tend to ignore stealing. Some say "the kids can't help it--it's their way of life." The children know very well that it is wrong. In the study centers, we never met a child who did not. To ignore this one kind of behavior seems very contemptuous on the part of adults. Sometimes, it clearly is. The teacher simply does not want to be bothered with that child. Other times, it is a kind of misplaced pity, and there is no place for pity in work with children. By ignoring behavior which they know to be wrong, adults are telling these children that they are not worth trying to educate. There can be no greater contempt on the part of adults. If a child has a hare-lip or other physical difficulty, the adults are generally very helpful. But stealing is a defect that is at least as serious, but too often ignored. Teachers are sometimes obviously frightened, as in the case of the child who brought a large knife to sixth grade. The teacher locked it in her desk, returned it after school and did not report it. She should have seen the anxiety that the study center saw in the other children that afternoon.

Volunteers do not seem as frightened as they are simply immobilized, and have to be reassured that these children deserve to be treated as they would want their own to be. Any of them would be furious to have such behavior ignored in their own children, but need encouragement to try to handle such incidents as they would want them handled, were their own children involved. It was in the cases of stealing that the professional staff was most often called upon. Although it was always better for the staff involved to handle the situation, they sometimes felt at a loss to. By sitting in, and seeing the obvious relief of the children that situations could be handled and not swept under the rug, they finally learned that such affairs could be handled fairly, without punitive measures.

There is a lot of discussion among teachers of the petty, seemingly senseless stealing that children in the inner-city engage in--stacks of mimeographed paper, as one teacher said "mimeographed on both sides--good only for airplanes and he doesn't know how to make them." This gradually came in the centers, after the first year, as a wish for something to carry home. The children would ask for "one piece of a puzzle" to carry home and bring back, or "one piece from the pick-up sticks." In addition to the pictures from magazines or writing paper that seemed to be reasonable because they had some meaning to the children, the staff noticed more and more general requests which seemed to mean that the children simply wanted "something to carry home with them." There are apparently many kinds of objects that can satisfy this need, and it is not hard to equate it with the middle-class child's rummaging through the wastebasket or the junk mail and taking the treasures to his room. An assortment of foreign or wildlife stamps and a collection of picture postcards were the easiest to find for the immediate problem. Other adults would have access to very different kinds of inexpensive or donated souvenirs that the children might treasure. The need seems to be a sincere one, and it would be reasonable for centers to anticipate this need of the children, rather than wait until they begin to ask or just take small items because they want something "from the center." Since we found this pattern so prevalent in the inner-city, teachers might be more aware of the apparent needs of the children. Most schools have expendable books, extra workbooks or lesson sheets. The staffs of study centers are convinced that the recognition of this need of the children, and their willingness to satisfy at least some of this need, helped the children to accept the fact that supplies used in the centers were needed for everyone, and had to be available there to be shared.

Discipline

Whether the children at the centers came from the "blockleader families" in one project, or from the "problem families" in a very deteriorated neighborhood, the amount of physical punishment administered to the children became obvious to the staff. In one case, a group of boys regularly compared notes and bragged about whose mother could inflict the worst scars. Children often reported beatings that other children had received. During the first six months, the parents at both centers independently developed the idea of keeping children from the center as an effective method of punishment. In all cases, this method was used with older children, and much more frequently with boys than with girls. Apparently the beating, or threat of one, was more successful with small children. However, the parents seemed to be grasping for "something that would work" and keeping the children from the study center seemed the most effective they could find. They were quick to explain that "since this seems to mean more to him than anything else it's the only way I can think of to punish him."

The staff had to become concerned with discipline in the home, for the first time, as a result of this pattern. It was unfair to volunteers to have them come, not knowing whether a child would be there or not. The parents understood this, but insisted that they could think of "no other way." Some mentioned that the staff seemed to not approve of beating. Just how they knew this was not clear. It was the policy of the centers not to hit children, and children quickly became aware of this. In each center, one or two parents had asked about this. One father came to visit and kept looking in the corners, finally approaching the coordinator to say that he was looking for "the big stick." "There must be one," he said, watching the children at work. He left, shaking his head in a puzzled way. But the children had obviously reported to the parents, who seemed very aware of center policy, and gradually aware of their own difficulty. No other problem seemed to concern parents more, and when they met the staff, they first wanted to know how the children "behaved."

The parents were obviously more at a loss when the staff had to tell them that in fairness to the volunteers, children should miss center appointments only when they were ill. The parents wanted short, quick answers to the problem of discipline, but there were none. It was immediately obvious that they had no understanding of punishment having any relationship to the offense. Most of them began to assign extra jobs to the children. Some mentioned that this was their solution to the problem of punishment and the children very often reported this form of punishment replacing the former beatings.

After the reports came in from one center that parents were using the technique of keeping children from the center as an effective punishment, it was only a matter of weeks until the same pattern developed at the other center. The staff at both centers were surprised by the apparent lack of understanding on the part of the parents that discipline should somehow be related to the offense, but they really should not have been. The children had talked quite freely of the favorite disciplinary techniques of various teachers. Often, according to the children, each teacher had a method which was meted out regardless of the offense. According to the children, punishment happens when you "be bad," and the only answer was to not do what you had been doing. They had been, at first, as bewildered as their parents at any attempt to discuss what restitution or behavior a child should show for having interfered in another child's work. Beyond "hit him" or "tell him to git out," they seemed to have no answer to any such problems.

Since teachers are the first to claim that discipline takes a great deal of their time, it would seem that somewhere in their training, they should have learned what discipline is. Perhaps because so much of their training is concerned with "how to" teach this or that subject, and so little concerned with how to teach children, they seemed, from the children's point of view, to be limited to the use of one technique which was automatically used for any offense.

Violence

Another major impression of inner-city children was the realization that they live in a more violent world than do middle-class children. Their reports of incidents occurring at home and on the way to and from school showed that they accepted calmly incidents that would have shocked the children of the volunteers. Children reported very matter-of-factly such events as their seeing a dead baby in a box on the street, as the police arrived.

"Fighting" among children in the centers never became a problem, since the children seemed to understand from the beginning that they could not interfere in the work of others. They talked a good deal about fighting outside of the center, and would sometimes jump up belligerently if another child challenged them or insulted them. When encouraged to talk about it instead of using their fists, the volunteers often reported that the children at first looked at the adults "as if they were demented."

Children often mentioned the need to fight in their neighborhoods. As one older boy said "in this neighborhood, if you don't fight, you'd be dead." But they usually accepted the center as a kind of neutral ground. There were often reports of fights—and visible evidence of them. One coordinator reported March as "Fight

Month" when an unusually large number of the children talked of fights on the way to and from school. The girls were often scratched, or had their clothing torn. A middle-class Negro volunteer said the most surprising part of the children's behavior to her was that the girls fought "just like boys." Certainly they were not exempt from the general pattern of resorting to physical violence.

Although the parents never put any pressure on the staffs to use physical punishment, many reported their feelings that it was necessary, and some reported their wish that the schools would use more physical punishment. They would report telling the teachers to hit the children whenever necessary; one expressed it as "just treat him like your own and hit him.". The mothers who did not want their children hit were certainly in a minority. Although the volunteers did not get the same pressure from the parents, they obviously do exert pressure on the schools for more use of physical punishment. They also rely very much on physical punishment in controlling their children.

Along with the problem of violence in the lives of these children was a growing awareness on the part of volunteers of the inhibitions they had to expressing positive emotions to other persons. There was a "lack of kindness" in their lives. This gradually concerned the staff more than the presence of violence.

If volunteers become sensitive to the reactions of the children, they are often aware of how much a gesture or word of praise means. The children tend not to say "please" and "thank you," or equivalent expressions. When volunteers saw the children with teachers and mothers, they were impressed with the adults' continually reminding the children of these expressions. Volunteers listened carefully for examples of kind remarks between children, or for expressions such as "please" and "thank you." They reported that the children never used them. Combined with this lack was the children's continual "helpfulness." They seem to express positive emotions more by actions than by words. They continually help adults and other children.

The staff often reported what they considered "over-reactions" to opportunities given to the children. An impressive example was in dramatics activities. Volunteers found it best to start with simple dress-up materials and make-up and suggestions for simple skits. The children would often say only one line, and that was sometimes spoken to the wall or the window, in a monotone. To the children, it was obviously a very special experience. In the following weeks, they gained poise and confidence. Six months later, they were composing their own short skits and performing them quite well. Their first efforts at dramatic activities were always the extreme example of how differently experience is viewed. To observers, the results were not impressive. To the children involved, it was obviously most rewarding. Volunteers working with these children gradually become able to see experiences "through the eyes of the children" and find their efforts well-rewarded.

The girls did sometimes ask for books about manners, and the staff could find no suitable ones that they could read. Those simple enough were considered too childish. In a "charm" course that the girls requested, they did get some help with their questions about manners. This is obviously a matter of concern to them, and an effective group worker could help such girls to compose their own pamphlet, as similar groups have composed booklets on baby-sitting.

Attitudes Toward Teachers

From the literature about inner-city children, one would expect great hostility to schools and teachers. This was simply not a factor among the children who come for academic help to the four study centers. Clearly we are dealing with a younger age group and a selected group.

However, no topic of conversation occupied as much of the children's free discussion as school and teachers. When they were not talking about events in the centers, they were talking about teachers or school, more often teachers. In fact, they talked so continually and exclusively about teachers that at both the store front and the housing project, volunteers felt that teachers were "almost frightenly, overwhelmingly important." This was the case at the housing project, where the children included some motivated and capable youngsters. It was also true at the storefront, with children of lower achievement but who were at least motivated enough to come for help.

School was the main activity these children shared in common outside of the center. In years of listening to the children's conversation, it was impressive that church was never mentioned, or scouts or any other voluntary group, although children were known to participate in one or another of these activities. These were mentioned to individual volunteers by individual children. But when children talked at the center among themselves, their conversation was almost always comparing notes on teachers, or expressions of concern or hope about next year's teacher.

Members of the project staff were sometimes invited to meet with groups of teachers to explain the work of the centers. Teachers seemed surprised to find that volunteers reported that, to the youngsters of the centers, the teachers were frightenly important. The volunteers hoped that because of their overwhelming importance to the children, they would be very careful of the way they react and talk to the children. The staff admitted that they do not know how the children express this preoccupation with teachers.

The staff also realized that one of their functions was to provide an outlet for some children who needed someone to "be mad at." Particularly the too well-behaved and inhibited children of the housing project were too dependent on their parents and teachers. A third of them had only one parent. It was as if they could not express belligerance toward either home or teachers. The luxury of being able to complain about work, decide when and how it was going to be done, was thoroughly enjoyed by them. With their need to be "good," there simply was no outlet at home or school for any unpleasant emotions. This was much more noticeable in the homework center, because of group interaction, but it is also obvious in individual sessions that many children test out a variety of emotions with one adult alone that he may well be unable to express either at home or at school.

Children often discussed school and teachers in individual sessions with a volunteer, although usually not until they knew them well. In group settings, discussion about teachers was in asides between children, and if adults showed interest in the conversation, they often stopped talking.

The main attribute of a good teacher and the highest compliment the children could pay one was "she (is) fair." Likewise, a poor teacher is "not fair." If a child complained that a teacher was "not fair," others might agree. When one disagreed, she said "yes, she not fair, but she make you learn." "Being fair" and "making you learn" were the most often repeated remarks about which teachers children liked.

By far the greatest complaint against schools and teachers was in regard to the theft of money, books or clothing. According to the children, "you be blamed" if something is stolen from you. The teachers apparently tell the children that it is entirely their responsibility. Money had to be carried in their shoes. The children obviously resented their attitude that theft was only the responsibility of the one who loses, and inevitable. Never once did the staff hear of a child getting something returned that had been stolen from him.

Classrooms that were particularly unruly were looked down upon by the children, and quickly identified by them. Teachers who were not fair and who did not make you learn were equated with the classrooms known to be chaotic. These were defined by the children as the classrooms "full of bad kids, who don't do no work, and teacher can't do nothin'. Least, she don't." A child's problem would be explained to other children by saying "no wonder--he in that awful room."

It is easy to see how their desire for order, and their need for structure has been misinterpreted to mean authoritarian rule. They are initially uneasy with new adult group workers, and need very much to know that the adult is in command of the situation. They are quick to suggest helpful measures, if they feel the situation is chaotic--"you gotta hit us." Despite the obvious difference between small groups in a volunteer setting and large, captive classrooms, the children often made comparisons. When a child was stopped from bothering one girl, she said "if you was in school, bam. That only thing make you be good."

When a group leader, who had previously taught school, sat on the floor to read a story, the children nudged each other and looked amused. One said "a teacher--sitting on the floor!" Another said "when you was a teacher, you didn't sit on the floor." She assured them that she had in fact, at story time in the primary grades. They shook their heads in disbelief.

Disturbed and Retarded Children

The experience of the study center was that emotionally disturbed children were not a basic problem. These youngsters rarely came to the attention of study centers. Just as the volunteers never considered the children "stupid," neither did they consider them to be emotionally disturbed. While the children who accept an offer of volunteer help are a select group because they are motivated to ask for help, they nevertheless represent a range of "problem" children. Particularly at North Park, the children were almost all considered to be problem children from problem families. They created discipline problems at school. But even in this center, among more than two hundred children who came during several years, only one child was obviously "disturbed." She was tested and found to be more than two years retarded academically, so that it was assumed that it would be very difficult for a volunteer to help her. She came in for homework help, and to be tested, and after three chances to observe her with the other children, the staff felt that she was extremely restless, belligerent and unpredictable. The mother came by to complain that she could do nothing with the girl, and said that the child was in psychiatric treatment.

The coordinator assumed responsibility for the girl when ever she came to the center. She let the girl work with her, kept her close to her physically, and away from the other children so that she would not have to be put out of the center. When possible, she helped her with some academic work. The girl was irregular in attendance, but became quite attached to the coordinator. The volunteers considered her to be obviously disturbed and were impressed with the coordinator's firm but gentle manner to which the girl responded well. She became very disruptive several times, but the coordinator was able to keep her from bothering the rest of the children and staff by devoting herself to the girl. The coordinator took her on one group trip, as the only child for whom she was responsible. Although the coordinator and volunteers had both been afraid that this would be very difficult, the child actually behaved much better on the trip than she usually did. Twice more the mother came by while the girl was at the center, and the volunteers reported that she seemed afraid of the girl and "the mother let her walk all over her."

After five months of sporadic attendance at the center, the girl confided that she had told her mother she no longer wanted to go to see the doctor, and her mother had said she need not. She stopped coming to the center except for very infrequent visits. The coordinator made a trip to the home to encourage the mother to discuss the need for more treatment with the school, but doubted that the mother would do so.

At Welles-Darrow, the children were selected with the help of a tenant aide, and she did not include any obviously disturbed children. Two of the boys were recommended by the school for help at a mental health clinic, but they were not considered as impossible by the volunteers as the child at the storefront.

The problems of anti-social behavior and of mentally slow children were much more serious for centers. Children at North Park and at STEP were from very disorganized multiple-program families. They did sometimes swear, ask for cigarettes, and behave in generally inacceptable ways, but this was not considered a severe problem by the staff.

Children who were genuinely slow, considered educable but mentally handicapped, were much more often encountered. They came on their own, or with parents who somehow hoped that such a center could do what the schools could not, and in nearly every group of school referrals, there were one or two in every fifty referrals. Just why the schools referred these children was never clear. They were often very well-behaved and eager for help. The reaction of volunteers was to want to help them, just as they often wanted to work with children who were more than two years retarded academically. Despite center policy of not working with these children, they came and some volunteers (often board members whom the coordinators felt uneasy about refusing) tried to work with them. Whether they worked with them for three months or for a year as they did in some cases, the results were always very poor. The volunteers became discouraged and wanted to quit, or the children dropped out.

The only feasible way to include these children is in homework help. In groups, they seem to enjoy so much being included with "normal" children that they will come and continue to come for some time.

At Welles-Darrow, one retarded boy was referred with the original school referrals. He was among the most eager, and the school reported that he never missed a day of school. He had the highest records of attendance at the center for three years. When the majority of the original group went to after-school reading classes, he was not included, and wanted very much to go. Even when a new group of more capable children came to the center, he continued as an active participant. New volunteers were always told that he was genuinely slow, so that they would not embarrass him. Often, they argued during the first days that no child so eager and willing to work could be slow, but always came to realize that he was. The skill of volunteers in including him in all activities was impressive, as was his own ability to participate by sitting near his special friend to watch his paper and his reactions. His teacher reported that he was given first grade work, since this was what he could do. The center tested him and found him able to work at lower second grade level. Four afternoons a week, he came for homework help, without homework. He was given a reading lesson and an arithmetic lesson. When the adults were busy, one of the other children worked with him. In the three years at the center, only once did a child react to the fact that he was obviously given special attention in class, and special efforts were made to help him participate. This was when a new child at summer school said in a reading class "he always gets baby words." The other children looked at her in surprise, and she seemed aware that her remark was inappropriate. The group worker mentioned that each child is asked to do what he can, and that Martin was one of the hardest workers in the group. It was obvious that Martin was a very pleasant child, whose parents had made him feel very accepted. While the staff never felt that Martin would be capable of normal achievement, his good nature and determination were most impressive. After two years at the center, Martin was moved from the special room for educable mentally handicapped children to a normal classroom. He was in the bottom track, but it was an enormous achievement for him, which he reported. Two years later, he was still able to achieve in the lowest track of a regular classroom.

The other child who came to Welles-Darrow who was retarded came with her mother, when the mother came to volunteer. The child did not bring homework, but sat "reading":big library books for the hour of academic work. She said that she was in seventh grade, but tested in third grade. The volunteers realized that she was not reading the books at all, but she sat quietly, slowly turning the pages of very difficult books. After two weeks, she began to read very simple books, when she realized that other children as big as she were doing so. No one was surprised when the school referral form was returned with "7th grade" marked off and EMH written in. One day the girl told a volunteer that her class was studying Africa, and she was offered a loan of a beginning reader from Liberia and a large map of Africa. The next day, a note came from the teacher saying that she had never seen the girl so excited about learning, and could the center accept eight more girls from her class. The center could not. Fortunately, the girl moved away a few months later, since it would have been difficult to include her in the special summer program.

With a homework center, it is possible to include children who would be too unrewarding for volunteers to tutor. While they cannot be expected to receive as much meaningful help, it is often the only opportunity for them to be with children who are not labelled as they are.

The most obvious characteristic of these genuinely slow children was their continual "forgetting" what they learned at the center. Despite the fact that this was true of Martin, he was included in the evening tutoring program for one year. The volunteer knew his situation,but wanted to work with him. Since he was a boy who would go anywhere at any time for academic help and review work with determination, he was still found to be rewarding.

The problem is not that these children are often encountered in tutoring projects. Occasionally volunteers are assigned to work with them because the center has no testing program before the children are assigned. If the criterion is applied that if the child is more than two years behind in reading, individual work once a week with volunteers is not appropriate, most severe problems of behavior and low achievement will be eliminated. They were found to be generally so difficult and unrewarding that their problems are best referred to professional help.

Cultural Deprivation

The term "cultural deprivation" became widespread several years ago, to explain the problems of inner-city children. Perhaps because educators could not admit that the shortage of books in classrooms, the hunger of the children, the rapid continual turnover of staff and children, or any other of the many well-documented problems of city schools had any relation to the childrens' poor work, they looked for a defect that could be "pinned on" the children.

"Cultural deprivation" apparently implied that a group was without "culture," and thus the term was later replaced by "cultural differences." The lack of background knowledge of poor children has been documented, and is obvious to anyone who works with them. However, the fact that they have other kinds of "know-how" is obvious to volunteers. In one center, volunteers were startled to find that the children knew the prices of basic foods, such as bread, milk and oleomargarine to the penny, each day and at each store within their neighborhood. They know many other valid pieces of information that are relevant in their lives, but are not recognized as important in school achievement.

Another reason for the pressure for labels such as cultural deprivation comes from the manner in which money is given to schools. Obviously, children in the cities were not receiving a satisfactory education, judged by the results of low-achievement scores. A case could be made that they have never received an ordinary education, but to explain their needs, such terms as "special education" had to be employed. Nor was it possible to receive money for ordinary, normal school children. Money for the schools had to be given to categories such as "gifted children" and "deprived children."

But there is growing pressure to change or abandon such terms because of the awareness that no group can be assumed to be without culture, or they could simply not have survived. Likewise, every group of children everywhere is lacking in understanding and knowledge of what is foreign to them. One teacher in a very prosperous suburb was startled to find that her second-graders all thought peas come only frozen in boxes. Thus, some special programs offered for "deprived children" are very promising. They are effective if they can be reread, leaving out the word "deprived," since they are basically good education for all.

A literature describing "deprived children" has been developed. One of the main premises of these writings seems to be that these children have a "slow and cautious learning style." Observations of our staff and volunteers found this assumption to be without basis. Some children in every group have a naturally slow and cautious style. Others work quickly and recklessly. Certainly in the testing program of the project, involving hundreds of children both within school in the control group and in a number of centers, the majority of the children never showed any signs of being "slow and cautious." The same was true of their academic work habits in general. There is hesitation and fear of being wrong, but the more normal reaction to this fear seemed to be to work quickly, read rapidly, finish the job and learn the sad news of failure in a hurry, because the suspense was unbearable. The halting hesitation and rapid guessing often went hand in hand, but the majority of observations emphasized the opposite of a slow, cautious attitude or approach to work.

In the study centers, it was only the few superior students who were thoughtful and careful. Most children needed encouragement to trust themselves enough to work more slowly. Our observations also showed that the children were aware of the premium placed in schools on finishing an assignment whether or not it was understood. Particularly in testing, they reported that teachers did not approve of leaving questions blank. This was so much a part of their orientation that most children only slowly accepted the idea that speed was not a major virtue in doing academic work.

CHAPTER V

THE IMPACT OF TUTORING: QUANTITATIVE MEASURES

A central concern of this project was the evaluation of the impact of turoring and volunteer work in education. The administration of even a very small after school study center involves some record keeping. These records often supply the basis for a partial evaluation of the impact of the program. While the use of such records does not make possible adequate comparisons with control groups, the findings are relevant in that they repeatedly present a converging conclusion. Thus in the course of this research and demonstration project, the principal investigator helped to establish an after school study center called the Mt. Pisgah Center. A teacher representative from a nearby school undertook a check of the academic progress of children who received regular tutorial assistance for six months. On the 120 children involved, 55 showed improvement, 31 showed no improvement and 34 were unable to be evaluated because they were transferred to other schools. There was also considerable evidence that these children's attitudes showed improvement.

At the South Shore Study Center, the coordinator conducted her own survey of students who were below grade level when they started tutoring. She found that about half of the total student group (over one hundred) each year improved sufficiently to get along at their own or above level or else returned for more tutoring. It is estimated that for the city of Chicago, three quarters of the youngsters are not reading at their grade level; for the social group attending the South Shore Center, the figure was much higher. In addition, the coordinator also followed-up a group in order to observe their academic performance one year after the end of tutoring. One third of these students were still performing in school at their academic level. The impact of tutoring was still seen, but the need for ongoing assistance for a longer period of time was also abundantly clear to those who worked with these students.

Repeated sources of such evidence from other centers must be taken as indicating some relevant impact, but the research design of this project made it possible to build in a control group and thus examine the relevance of different styles of administration. In addition, particular effort was made to maintain better records so that academic performance could be measured repeatedly and linked to the number of months of tutoring.

Controlled Comparison

At the four experimental after school study centers, the reading ability of the students and the progress they made during the periods in which they were being tutored was determined by the Gates Reading Tests. The Gates Primary, Advanced Primary and Survey reading tests, developed by Arthur I. Gates of Columbia University, test at various grade levels.[1] These tests were an integral part of the research design and the testing of reading ability emerged as a crucial aspect of the program of the study centers also. Adequate information on the reading level of the youngsters was not available from the schools. Such information was valuable for the guidance of the tutors and for the students as well. In the last years of the study, these tests were replaced by the Gates-MacGinitic tests, which are comparable. The data presented is from the testing done with the earlier forms.

---

[1] Arthur I. Gates Manual for the Gates Primary, Advanced Primary and Survey Tests. (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958).

In each center it was essential that testing be carried out at least two times. At STEP, only one test was possible, reflecting the very loose and unstable organization and administration of this enterprise. At the three other centers, tests were repeated several times on most of the children so that their progress or regression could be measured. In addition, these tests were administered to a control group. The control group, like the experimental population, was essentially all-Negro with only an occasional white student. The social status of the control group was from a working class background and superior to the poverty background of most children who attended the study centers in the demonstration project. This was done deliberately so that any positive results from tutoring could not be attributed to superior social background.

In assembling data on youngsters in various study centers, those who were tutored were divided into four groups on the basis of the time period when they started in the tutoring program: (1) before fall 1965; (2) fall of 1965; (3) winter and spring 1966; and (4) summer 1966. This breakdown made it possible to assess the impact of tutoring in terms of the amount of time a youngster was exposed to such assistance and in terms of the relative degree of backwardness he or she displayed when the tutoring started.

The Gates Reading Tests are designed to produce a score reflecting the grade level of the student who is tested. Thus, a sixth grade child's expected score in September is 6.0, 6.1 in October, 6.2 in November, and ending with 6.9 in June. When the child's actual performance in the reading test is compared with the expected level of performance, a simple measure of above grade or below grade is produced. This was called "performance level score." If a sixth grade student read at the 5.2 grade level in September, his score would be -.8 (6.0 minus 5.2); or if this student read at 7.2, his score would be +1.2.

Some discussion of the children's response to testing is required before the statistical findings are presented. Before the project had been launched, requests for "testing" came in from several outside centers. These coordinators reported that the children asked for a "day of testing." The staffs of volunteer centers were surprised, since it was assumed that their children would be hostile to testing. The principal investigator suspected that the children wanted an opprotunity to learn about testing, and this turned out to be the case. Whenever tests were used, the children responded favorably. In three years of testing for this study, only one child refused to take a test, but wanted to take one as soon as he saw the other children studying theirs the following week.

Volunteers often had questions about the tests. They considered them culturally weighted and unfair to the children. While this was admitted, their relevance for school tests and for school tasks became obvious to the volunteers.

At South Shore, children in the fourth grade were usually given the Gates Survey test, appropriate for their grade level. The children at Welles-Darrow were also able to take this test at fourth grade level. At North Park, the children were consistently more retarded, and fourth graders were usually given the Advanced Primary first. Only if they showed that they could do enough of the harder one was it administered. There was great consistency in scores between what children scored on a test that was below their grade level, and how they performed on a test for their proper grade level. On the easier test, however, they answered many more questions and it was more possible to see their mistakes, and the pattern to their work. Their own positive reactions to the test indicated that this form was preferable for them. With a test so difficult that they could only give a few answers and then had to stop, they seemed to feel much more defeated.

Therefore, the usual procedure was for the children to be given a test form on which they could do a respectable amount of work. They were retested on a different form of that test a semester later. A semester after that, they were usually given the Survey, appropriate for their grade level. This special arrangement applied only to fourth graders, but very retarded readers at fifth grade level were also given the Advanced Primary if it seemed more valid for them.

During the first year at North Park and South Shore, the pattern of achievement became clear; approximately one month gain for one month of tutoring for those children who were seen regularly by the same volunteer for at least a semester. The pattern of nearly one month progress in one month was the most common result, and appeared to be the pattern, as well as the average.

When children made less gain, or none at all, it coincided closely with the volunteer reports that the child was not making much progress. Usually, it turned out to also tally with the school observations that the child was not completing homework regularly, or achieving in school. These were largely older children, especially boys who had to be told honestly that the center did not feel that they were making any progress. They were told that the help was only supplementary, and it was assumed that they also worked in school. Unless they did their homework regularly and also tried in school, the one lesson a week at the center could not help them.

Volunteers were often reluctant to talk to the children honestly about their lack of progress, and the coordinator often had to assume this job. The reaction of the children was to insist that they wanted to continue tutoring, and would try harder. Only about five children of fifty were dropped each year because of insufficient progress, and in each case, only if the volunteer was leaving. Even they were put on the waiting list, and told to decide whether they wanted to make a real effort. They usually came back within a month or two and asked for more help.

The children who remained with the same volunteer for a second year continued in general the same pattern of one month gain in one month, but the pattern was more consistent and school grades more often reflected increased achievement. A minority of children were continued for a third year, and the pattern remained unchanged. However, because of low achievement in their schools, a child who was kept from further retardation for two years was, by sixth or seventh grade, a good achiever in his school. The children would bring their report cards to show that they were doing very well, and would ask why the center staff still thought they needed help. Since a reading level of 6.0 is all that is required for a regular high school course, children could be helped to achieve that well, and were satisfied.

Initially, the project staff felt that testing was primarily of benefit to the tutors, and their reaction to the tests, wherever used, was very positive. They often expressed regret at the evidence that they were only "treading water" and keeping the child from further retardation, although this was explained to them as a desirable and expected goal. Older volunteers found the evidence more reassuring, while young adults were able to accept this sign of progress as they gradually realized that the attitudes and poor work habits of the children which kept them from achievement were also changing.

After using the tests for several years, the staff felt that the children themselves benefitted from the experience of taking tests. When it was explained to them that they were confidential and not part of their school records, they came to understand that the tests were meant to help them and their tutors. The fact that the tests came in three different forms meant that they could study them, find their errors and see what kinds of work they did poorly in. Despite the low scores, their reactions were never completely negative. The usual reaction was for the children to become critical of the job they had done. "I coulda done that." "Why'd I skip one?" Despite their obvious ability todo better, they did not usually do a lot more careful job on the retesting, although there were usually indications that they were learning about taking tests. Each time they were tested, they seemed more able to achieve closer to their real ability, but it was a slow process. Brighter children seemed to benefit the most from the testing experience, and could often study their tests by themselves and show that they understood their mistakes very well. They were the ones who quickly developed testing "know-how." Study center children were always retested with different forms of the test, since they had studied the previous test. The same was true for the control group.

It is necessary to examine these test score data in a number of different ways as presented in Table No. 5.1. First, the performance level score presents a measure of how far behind grade level and how far ahead of grade level the students of a given study center were when they started their tutoring experiences. At all three study centers the youngsters were behind their grade level; at North Park they were the furthest behind, -1.23 years; at South Shore next, -1.07 and the least at Welles-Darrow, -.62.

The positive impact of tutoring can be seen from the fact that the final performance level scores, the scores that were recorded

Table No. 5.1

Impact of Tutoring

Reading Scores Before and After Tutoring

Performance Level Score	North Park	Welles-Darrow	South Shore	Control Group
Initial (Before Tutoring)	-1.23	-0.62	-1.07	-0.43
(Number of Cases)	(48)	(67)	(97)	(79)
Final (After Tutoring)	-1.02	+ .06	-. 68	-0.72
Performance Ratio				
Mean	0.096	0.167	0.113	0.079
SD	0.093	0.178	0.150	0.054
Median	0.082	0.125	0.100	0.067

after the tutoring was completed, were better in all three study centers. To be more precise, the amount of retardation declined; that is, the size of the negative score was reduced and in one case, the Welles-Darrow project, the score actually became positive. The final performance level score is based on the averages of nineteen before and after comparisons, of one academic year duration in each comparison. In 13 cases the reading scores improved, in three comparisons there was no change, and in only three comparisons were the results negative. The significance of these findings were highlighted when compared with the findings of the control group, which were observed to have followed the normal slum school pattern and to have slipped further behind (from -0.43 to -0.72). It should be noted, however, that during the summer months when tutoring programs were curtailed or abandoned, the youngsters tended to lose some of their progress.

This array of data does not standardize the number of months each youngster was tutored. For this purpose, a performance ratio was constructed of those youngsters for whom there were two or more reading scores. The score of the first reading test was deducted from the last available score and the difference then divided by the actual number of months the child had spent in his school between the first and the last available test. Thus a child who scored 6.5 in the month of January and 6.9 in the following November would receive a Performance Ratio of 6.9-6.5 ÷ 8 = 0.05 (8 was the number of actual months spent at the study center with allowance made for the summer months). Thus, a child who made normal progress at school would obtain a performance ratio score close to 0.10 indicating that approximately a month's work was accomplished in a month's time. Summer months were deducted only when tutoring was discontinued during that time. Since North Park's tutoring program continued the year around, no reduction in months was made for the summer.

For STEP, it was not possible to apply this score since retesting could not be carried out. However, the performance ratios for the three other study centers and for the control group are presented in Table 5.1. First, it should be noted that the performance ratio was lowest in the control group, indicating the overall effectiveness of tutoring which is carried out in a relatively stable environment. Among the three tutoring groups, the Welles-Darrow project had the highest mean of performance ratio (.167), Shouth Shore the next (.113), and North Park just slightly lower (.096). The principal investigator had expected that the Welles-Darrow and South Shore performance would exceed that of North Park and this was confirmed by these data. The differences between Welles-Darrow and South Shore in part reflects differences in the type of student recruited, since approximately half the group at Welles-Darrow were from the top tracks of their school, and were considered superior students not in need of remedial help. However, their scores on the Gates tests revealed a pattern of retardation of about six months, by national standards. The other centers had only a few children with retardation as low as six months.

Below, an analysis of the internal dynamics of the various study centers is presented in order to help explain the differences in level of performance between study centers. While children at North Park and South Shore received individual help once a week, the length of the sessions was different. North Park children received one lesson of one and a half hours a week. South Shore students had one-hour lesson a week. At Welles-Darrow, the children came for "homework help" one to four afternoons a week. None attended less than twice, by choice. This group help was given either by adults or by older children. Although some students also had individual appointments one evening a week in a tutoring project at the same center, this program was viewed by staff observers as "social education." It was the afternoon help two to four afternoons--usually as a member of a small group--that was the core of the program. Our staff's experience with groups continually demonstrated that students who were one to two years retarded were not as able to function in groups, but that group work was much easier with children who were approximately six months retarded.

Similar quantitative results on the effectiveness of tutoring were encountered in the evaluation of the tutoring program instituted by Mobilization for Youth, Inc.[2] The tutorial program featured the employment of tenth and eleventh grade students as tutors for fourth and fifth grade pupils whose reading achievement was below grade level. The tutors were paid $11 per week for six hours of tutoring and two hours of in-service training. The tutoring took place from 3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M. on Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays. One group was tutored two hours per week; another four hours per week. The mean reading level of the 240 tutors employed in the program was grade 10.0; twenty-two per cent were reading below the eighth grade level.

---

[2] Robert D. Cloward "Studies in Tutoring," The Journal of Experimental Education, Fall, 1967.

The sample of students for analysis included 356 experimental subjects and 157 control subjects. Pupil reading achievement was measured on a before and after basis, using the New York Tests of Growth in Reading, Level C, Form 1 (revised). It was revealed that for the two hour group, "the mean difference in growth of 1.03 raw score between experimental and control subject was not significant." However, "the difference of 2.74 raw score points between the change means of the four hour pupils and the control pupils was significant..."

"In terms of grade equivalents, the four hour pupils showed an average of six months' reading improvement in five months' time whereas the control students showed only three and a half months growth during the same period." Thus, the four hour group not only arrested their retardation but began to catch up. "Tutorial assistance results in significant reading improvement provided that the assistance is given as often as four hours per week for a period of 26 weeks." The observation is, of course, based on the experience of using high school students as tutors.

The research also demonstrated that involvement in the program had a beneficial effect on the reading scores of the tutors. The program did not demonstrate that over the short run school grades were improved, but at least the tutoring program prevented increased retardation. Improved performance in future periods, if tutoring is continued, is clearly a reasonable expectation.

In order to understand the impact of tutoring and the value of controlling retardation, the data from the control group demonstrates what is "normal" progress in inner-city schools. These schools, located in a medium-sized city in Illinois, were not poverty schools, but fundamentally all-Negro schools in lower working class areas. Children from two schools were tested.

Slightly more than one-third of the children moved in one year between testing, and several classes were transferred to other schools. However, testing and retesting in a series of classes was done both years to illustrate the gradual retardation that is "normal" in these schools. Principals in inner-city Chicago schools who studied the data from the control groups claimed that this pattern was the same found in their schools.

Specifically, in X school, class size averaged 21 the first year testing was done, and 26.7 the year that retesting was carried out. In Y school, the average class size was 29 the first year, and 27 when retesting was done. In X school, at third grade level, six of 22 children were achieving normally. (One was a non-reader.) The average retardation for the class was .30 months (3 months). Average retardation for fourth graders was .83 months, and fifth graders, .735. By sixth grade, the average retardation was 1.45 (fourteen and a half months), and only four of 24 students were achieving a normal score in reading.

The next year when retested, the average retardation in fourth grade was found to have increased to .52 and .675. In each fourth grade, eight children were achieving at normal level or above. The fifth graders averaged 1.37 and 1.14 retardation, and only one child in the two classrooms was reading at grade level.

At Y school, the retardation for the first testing was .177 at third grade level, .583 at fourth grade level, .514 at fifth grade level, and 1.41 at sixth grade level. Nine children in third grade were achieving normal scores for their grade placement. By the sixth grade, only one was achieving at grade level.

When retested a year later, the same fourth graders who had averaged .177 retardation a year before were drawn for retesting from three classrooms and averaged a retardation of .771. "Ability grouping" had been done at fifth and sixth grade. The "high" fifth grade had an average retardation of .380, with seven children achieving normal scores. The "low" fifth grade had an average retardation of 1.50 with no child receiving a normal score. The "high" sixth grade had an average retardation of .257, with nine children scoring normally. However, these scores were found to be deceptive, since speed scores were much higher than vocabulary and comprehension. When only vocabulary and comprehension were considered, the average retardation was .80. The teacher of this group claimed that she had drilled the children in speed to help them get ready for junior high school. The "low" sixth grade averaged 1.50 retardation, with two children scoring normally.

In the control group, three non-readers were eliminated from the sample each year. Their scores would have lowered the average more. By signing a name on a reading test, a child automatically receives a minimum score from 1.7 to 2.0. By guessing, a non-reader can score above the minimum.

The tests for the control group were scored and returned to the classroom teachers, who studied them with the children, encouraging the children to identify their errors, just as volunteers did in the study centers. The classroom teachers felt that this was a very meaningful experience for the children, and it was the first time that such an opportunity had been offered to them. Testing was always done by a qualified member of the project staff, although volunteers and teachers often remained with the children. The tests were scored by hand, usually double-scored, and the children encouraged to check the scoring and figure out their own scores. At least a paragraph of interpretation of each child's test was included with the scored test. Volunteers insist that this is crucial, and that scores alone would not be easily understood by them.

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the project staff had been deeply concerned about the comprehension ability of study center youngsters as revealed in discrepancies in their scores. If separate scores in speed, comprehension and vocabulary differ a given amount at any level, the difference is considered "significant." Study center children showed a pattern of significantly different scores, with comprehension the usual low scores. The control group showed exactly the same pattern. Of 190 tests administered in X school, 98 showed "significant" differences in scores and these were overwhelmingly in low comprehension. Of 223 tests given in Y school, 106 showed "significant" differences in scores, again primarily involving low comprehension. Of the total 413 tests administered in two schools (including retests), 86 resulted in average or above average scores. Six tests of non-readers were eliminated from the total.

During the three years of the study, the project staff tested in six additional inner-city centers which did not have these facilities and where individual tutoring was conducted once a week. Five of them recruited from the public schools, and they believed that they were working with children who were "six months to two years retarded in reading." None of these five projects had a majority of children in the category they claimed to serve: Instead, these students were frequently superior or much further behind. Typical of the population of these centers was a settlement house, with professional supervision and all of the other criteria for a successful program. Of the 69 children included in their center, 34 were found in testing to fit the category defined by the sponsoring agency; 35 did not. Of the 35, sixteen were above grade level (fourteen of them from more than a year to two years ahead), five were non-readers (including three who were in EMH (Educable Mentally Handicapped-retarded) classes in school), eight were less than six months retarded, and six children were from two and a half years to more than three years retarded in reading. One other study center in which the project staff conducted testing was found to have a majority of children who fitted the category they claimed to have. This center was located in a public housing project, where a local mother had done the recruiting.

Cost Analysis

From the quantitative data presented above, it appears that volunteer tutors can make an effective contribution to the educational progress of inner-city school children. The data which was collected on the cost of managing such after school study centers, while it does not permit precise cost-benefit analysis, clearly indicate that such funds appear well spent. In contrast to many expensive programs which produce no clear cut results, such as the More Effective Schools Program of New York City, the case for volunteer tutoring can be well documented.

The data collected on the cost-per-student in the four after-school study centers is most revealing and helps give further validity to the findings about the relative academic performance. There was a rough relationship between low per pupil cost and relative success in overcoming academic retardation in reading. STEP, which was found to have the highest per pupil cost, was the agency that had to be judged as the least effective. It was so unstable that academic performance could not be adequately evaluated. By contrast, the Welles-Darrow program, which produced the most marked academic advancement, had the lowest per pupil cost. South Shore and North Park, which were in the middle on academic performance, were also in the middle on per pupil costs. More precisely, the difference between these two efforts in per pupil cost were not great, but South Shore, which had a higher per pupil cost than North Park, also had a higher level of academic performance. Thus a positive relation between low per pupil cost and academic effectiveness was clearly present but it was not a perfect relationship.

From an overall point of view, the issue can be stated in other terms. In evaluating the effectiveness of tutoring, the relative costs need to be taken into consideration. While volunteer work seems to have a positive benefit, it is clear that relative costs indicate that differences in organizational format need to be kept in mind, since there are real differences between the four study centers.

All four of the after school study centers had working budgets. These budgets are much less well developed than those of traditional social agencies and were often adjusted on a day-to-day basis. In the course of the research, special efforts were made to collect data for the year 1965-66 in order to estimate as carefully as possible the cost per student. In each study center there usually were some core items which were appropriated on a yearly basis. Thus, for example, at North Park and Welles-Darrow the salaries of the coordinators were paid by the demonstration and evaluation project; at North Park the rent was underwritten by the Boys Club; salary of the coordinator for STEP for a four and one-half month period was a lump sum item; and most of the costs of the South Shore effort was paid by the YMCA on an annual basis. However, it was essential for these study centers to seek separate funding for the basic costs. The source of such income came from a variety of individuals. In addition, at each one of the study centers there were resources such as utilities, supplies, and books obtained on a contributory basis rather than by a financial transaction and therefore it was difficult to develop a precise accounting of the costs involved.

In 1965-66, STEP obtained approximately $500 from the Student Government of the University of Chicago; $250 from the Chapel associated with the University, and an additional $200 from a fund drive for the study center conducted on the University campus. As mentioned above, the coordinator was on the payroll of the demonstration and evaluation project for approximately four and a half months and received a total salary of $1,080 for the period at the rate of $2 an hour for 30 hours a week. A public service fellowship from the student government paid an estimated amount of $1,000 for the coordinator's administrative assistant for the year. Actual dollar expenses included approximately $400 in books and supplies plus $150 for trips and administrative expenditures. Telephone costs were estimated to be approximately $20.

The space available in the church would not ordinarily be used or rented. However, a similar type of arrangement in the neighborhood rented for approximately $175 to $225 a month, or roughly speaking the yearly estimated costs for space would be approximately $2,400. This cost would ordinarily include heat, but the cost of electricity was estimated at approximately $150 a year. The estimated costs of the donated books and supplies beyond those which were purchased was approximately $50.

STEP had a total of 71 children for the tutoring of 1965-66. Thus, on the basis of actual dollars spent the cost per child was close to $39. If the estimated costs of the resources available to this after school study center is included in the calculation, the unit cost per child was close to $75 per year.

In 1965-66 North Park started the year with approximately $300 left over from the previous year's operation. The local alderman donated $300 for the year while the demonstration project paid approximately $1,500 for the coordinator's salary, and the Boys Club underwrote the rent, which amounted to $720. A special fund-raising drive in June 1966 brought in $640. At the end of the year the study center had a total of $650 remaining in its bank account.

Other dollar expenditures included $100 for electricity; $90 for telephone; $75 for supplies; $100 for games and equipment; and $30 for payment to local boys who swept and cleaned the study center. Another $75 was spent for equipment, drapes and paint. One hundred and twenty dollars was used for trips. The demonstration and evaluation project provided supplies for the study center which were estimated to have cost $75. Individual donations of books and supplies equaled approximately $25.

North Park had a total of 66 children for tutoring in 1965-66. The unit cost per child in actual dollars spent amounted to approximately $42 per year. When the additional costs of the resources available to North Park were included, the unit cost per child increased to slightly less than $44 per year during 1965-66.

During the year 1965-66 the coordinator of the Welles-Darrow study center was paid approximately $1,800 by the demonstration and evaluation project. In addition, the demonstration and evaluation project spent $200 for supplies during the year. The project also underwrote the payment of $175 during the year to a local resident who worked as the coordinator's assistant and $50 for payment for babysitters to women who did volunteer tutoring. While it is difficult to estimate the cost of the rent, after an interview with the community and tenant relations adie at the local office of the housing authority the value of the rent, utilities and telephone was estimated to be approximately $125 a month or $1,500 a year--this represented the Chicago Housing Authority's contribution. The Authority also provided supplies and refreshments to the children at a cost which was estimated to be $200. The donated books and other supplies used by the study center totaled approximately $150.

Welles-Darrow had a total of 79 children during the year 1965-66. The unit cost in dollars spent in the tutoring program amounted to slightly less than $28 per child. When the estimated costs of the facilities provided by the Chicago Housing Authority and other groups was included in the calculation, the unit cost per child increased to $51. It should be noted that this calculation also includes the costs of the summer group activities as well.

The South Shore effort was officially part of the YMCA in the year 1965-66. Although it is somewhat arbitrary, the distinction between actual dollar expenses and contributed resources applies in this case as well. The YMCA paid one dollar to the coordinator for the year and spent approximately $1,500 for supplies and utilities. In addition, the YMCA paid three college students who worked as coordinator's assistants at the rate of $1 per hour for approximately 10 hours a week for nine months. It expended about $1,700 during the year on this item.

The space available within the YMCA was estimated to cost approximately $1,800 a year and services of a professionally trained social worker who served as coordinator were estimated at around $4,000. The South Shore Y served a total of 137 students during the program year 1965-66. The unit costs in actual dollars spent was approximately $23 per child for the year. When all of the estimated costs were calculated, the approximate cost per child increased to $66. (Table No. 5.2 summarizes these data).

Thus, while fully recognizing the limited scope of the data collected, these findings not only demonstrate the effectiveness of tutoring and volunteer work in education. They also indicate, when taken together with the cost data, that observations can be made about differential effectiveness. STEP must be judged as the least effective, while the other three study centers fall into the more effective category. The purpose of Chapter VII is to help identify some crucial dimensions in the operating format of study centers which might account for these differences.

Table No. 5.2

Total and Unit Costs of Four Study Centers, 1965-1966

	STEP	North Park	Welles-Darrow	South Shore
Actual total cost in dollars	$2,750	$2,810	$2,225	$3,201
Actual unit cost per child per year in dollars	39	42	28	23
Estimated value of additional resources	2,600	100	1,850	5,800
Adjusted unit cost per child per year	75	44	51	66

CHAPTER VI

THE IMPACT OF TUTORING: CASE HISTORIES OF STUDENTS

Case histories of selected students--both failures and successes--supply an additional source of documentation of the impact of after school study centers. The seven case histories presented in this chapter offer a picture in some depth about the mechanisms and processes by which the tutors and students relate to one another.

These case summaries are in part incomplete because they are based entirely on materials supplied by the children or the families. School records and Chicago Housing Authority records are confidential, and the project staff respected this confidentiality. Teachers occasionally noted a child's I.Q. score, which was supposed to be confidential, and this was removed from our records.

There was only one case in which the staff did seek verification concerning a child's bizarre stories. This was when a little boy attached himself to a volunteer on the first evening of a tutoring program. He confided to her that "my father is in jail," and returned to her to repeat this statement several times. He persisted in confiding in her, and looking to her for an answer, so she finally asked "what for?" The child said softly, "for killing my mother." He remained very close to the volunteer all evening, and all during the semester they both attended the center, but never confided in anyone else. The staff confirmed the story with authorities. The rest of the staff never knew of the incident, but it seemed important to the volunteer to know.

A wish to know more about the children was expressed by some volunteers. Some seemed to believe that the more that that is known about the children, the better one can help them. The children often behave so differently in a new setting, however, that if such centers are serious about being a "second chance" for the children involved, it is not always necessary for the staff to know in the beginning that a child, for example, is a chronic trouble-maker. Excessive probing runs the risk of making a mockery of "confidential" records. At the same time, it seems important for volunteers to know that a great deal is and can be learned by observation of a child once a week, and from the normal contacts that can come from the parents' involvement in a center program.

The names given to the children were selected from names which did not belong to any child in the centers with which the project cooperated. Details of family were in some cases disguised to protect identity. The case summaries are primarily based on records kept by non-professionals, and reports written by them. Although every center had experienced teachers as volunteers, their reports tend to be in "lesson plan" form. It was primarily volunteers without professional teaching or social work background who wrote the most detailed records.

These cases are based on youngsters who had rather extensive contact with study centers. The pattern in this respect is similar to the seven brief summaries of study center children included in the book "Helping Hands." Three years after the publication of the volume, it is impressive that six of the seven children are still known to the project staff. One moved out of the city. Four of the children or their mothers maintain some contact with the volunteers who saw them. One sees his volunteer approximately every two weeks and the volunteer plans to continue contact through high school. Three other children, or their mothers, occasionally call the volunteers. They usually call to report a special event--a good report card, a special school activity, or a new baby in the home. "I thought you'd like to know," they often say. Two other children are known to be doing good work in school, although they have never called the volunteers or staff.

Even the one case presented as a failure was known, during the two years after tutoring was discontinued, to have asked a teacher for extra help. This was interpreted by the school as a result of his awareness developed at the center that help was available.

Daniel

On the first day of a summer program at a volunteer study center in a housing project, one of the older boys brought his friend Daniel, who was new in the neighborhood. Daniel was a thirteen year old boy who was well dressed and polite. Although his case history appears to be special, his situation is rather typical. On the whole, there was a markedly higher level of performance and involvement in the study center than in the school classroom, reflecting the wastage of human talent and resources in the inner city slum school.

On the first day of his visit to the study center, Daniel asked if he could join the summer program and he was immediately enrolled. He gave the impression of an intelligent and alert youngster who could benefit from additional academic help. Throughout the summer this initial impression was confirmed. But this presentation was at odds with his normal reputation. When his name was mentioned to the social worker of the housing project, she was surprised by the positive comments of the volunteer staff. He came from a family which was not able to give much supervision to its children, and they often created trouble in the community. She thought that the boy must be assuming a great deal of responsibility for himself and deserved credit for his efforts on his own behalf.

During each of the four mornings of the six weeks' summer program, there was a different group of volunteers at the center, but all recognized that Daniel was one of the brightest children in the center. The group was primarily children from the top track in the local public school who, by the school standards, did not need academic help. By the reading tests and observations at the center, they were judged to be generally very normal achievers, with a few exceptions in both directions. A few were actually below grade level, and a few were above. Daniel seemed to be as capable as the ones who tested at grade level, and was certainly among the most motivated to achieve.

Two experienced teachers who taught him literature and social studies were particularly impressed with Daniel. One of them was startled to learn from him that he had just flunked seventh grade in his old neighborhood. He would transfer to the local public school in the fall. The coordinator sent a letter to his former teacher, who later telephoned in response. When she heard of the center's impression of Daniel's intelligence, she said that she had personally always doubted the rather low I.Q. that the school had on record. However, he "had always done very poorly academically, and this was hardly surprising in view of his attitude toward school." When asked about his attitude, she said that while there were no specific problems with misbehavior, there was a continual problem with Daniel's missing school. Neither he nor his mother were co-operative and the school knew that he was not ill, as he claimed to be. It was obvious that the teacher resented what she considered an irresponsible attitude.

Nothing could have been further from the impression of the study center staff. They continued to observe him with interest to understand how the school personnel could have been so far wrong. Daniel continued to be prompt, attentive and most capable. He once stayed after class to ask for the alphabet in Japanese, after a Japanese visitor had been there. After he had played chess for the first time, he asked for the rules so he could "study them." When the students were given word puzzles or problems to take home, Daniel was one of the most eager and capable in doing these extra activities.

Daniel was the only child of twenty-nine in the program who was complimented by the other children. A boy who had trouble keeping up with the rest academically referred to Daniel as "the brain," and this was repeated several times by other children. He was among the first chosen for competitive teams and once when he made a mistake, the boy who had given him the nickname loudly berated him. Daniel was embarrassed and apologetically said "I can't get them all."

At the graduation party at the end of the summer school, a staff member talked to Daniel's mother at length. She is a meek, rather apathetic woman who works very long hours and is seldom home in the day. The mother looked so genuinely puzzled when the staff person began to describe Daniel's participation in summer school, that she seemed on the verge of asking if this was really her son. She was so non-committal that the staff member felt she assumed this was a "polite" report given to all parents. After a half hour of describing Daniel's work, the volunteer felt that his mother did believe her and was very pleased. In talking to dozens of parents, however, the staff member had never met one who knew less about her child. It was obvious that the mother had never been told that Daniel was a capable boy. While she seemed puzzled, she was also pleased.

The staff member told Daniel's mother that the center was quite surprised that he should have failed seventh grade, and was interested to find out why. The mother became very vague. "Daniel didn't get along very good in that school." The volunteer told her that they were certain of only one thing, and that was that Daniel's failure was not due to lack of ability. But it is not enough that he did such good work in the center. He will, the staff hoped, start off in the new school with the same attitude, because his ability will be of no use to him unless he is able to use it and show them what good work he can do. If he could do this, there was reason to believe that someday she could be very proud of her son. He ought to do very well in high school and might qualify for help to go on to school, if he could continue to work as he had through the summer. The mother expressed sincere, restrained appreciation for the staff's interest.

One of the experienced teacher volunteers decided that Daniel's eyesight was a problem and arranged for him to have a free examination after summer school ended. An aunt who lived near the family assumed responsibility for the children while the mother worked. She readily gave her permission for the examination, and the volunteer took him. The doctor said that Daniel needed glasses, which he would gladly provide, but he also needed eye treatments, without which the glasses would not be helpful. The optometrist to whom he had gone was located too far for him to go regularly for treatments, so an eyeclinic near his home had to be found. The coordinator called the closest clinic and asked for information. She specifically wanted to know about the expenses involved and if it would be alright for the aunt or a volunteer to bring Daniel, since the mother worked. She was told that this was fine, and someone should bring him at 8:00 A.M. The woman to whom she talked was very polite and said "tell them to ask for Mrs. __________ and I'll take care of them."

Daniel's aunt called the next afternoon shortly after two o'clock. She had just returned from the clinic and was very upset.

They had arrived at 8:00 A.M. and given the name of the woman who had talked to the coordinator. At 9:30 the woman appeared and wanted to know where Daniel's mother was, since "obviously" the boy's mother had to bring him. The aunt was ready to leave, but the woman finally said she might as well stay. There was an additional charge that the coordinator had not been told of, but fortunately, the aunt had enough money with her.

After waiting until nearly two o'clock and seeing no one else, Daniel and his aunt went home. They had not had breakfast or lunch. The coordinator told her how sorry she was and how she regretted their experience, when she tried only to help. But there was no other available clinic for Daniel. Someone had to take him again, and the coordinator offered to. The aunt refused the offer and said that she would try "once more." The next day they returned to the clinic and were seen by mid-morning. The doctors were polite to them, agreed with the previous diagnosis, and volunteers gave a $10 donation toward the cost of the glasses. The aunt wrote a letter of thanks to the center staff.

At the end of the summer, the study center sent a report to the school to which Daniel was transferring, which most of the study center children attended. The coordinator felt that Daniel belonged with his new friends, who were in the top track, and that if the school tested him he could well be placed there. The report was based on his participation in the summer program. He had read and discussed literature more difficult than his "reading level" would indicate. His reading score was not reported, since that particular school had seemed resentful of such information in the past. His reading score at the center was based on a test taken during the first week. His average was 6.6, in contrast with his grade placement of 7.0 in the fall, if he repeated seventh grade. On the measurement of accuracy in the test, he rated "very low."

No answer was received from the school, and no efforts made to determine Daniel's ability. In both middle-class and lower-class communities it is quite common for grade placement to be handled by the school clerk, and for new children to be assigned to the bottom track, no matter what records they bring from former schools. In Daniel's case, his previous records would justify such placement.

As expected, in the fall Daniel was placed in the bottom track of the seventh grade in the local public school. He attended the center regularly in the afternoon, and was included in a once a week evening tutoring program which started in October. A young woman from a local business company saw him for two months, and then found a substitute from the same company when she was transferred. They both liked working with Daniel, mainly in homework assignments, and each of them took him to dinner several times in local restaurants, or at home with their families.

During the first week of school, Daniel had trouble. He was lined up in the hall with his class. The pupils were told that anyone who opened his mouth would be dealt with severely. Another boy shoved Daniel and he in turn socked the boy. The teacher saw Daniel hit the boy, and suspended him from school for fighting. Similar incidents happened at the center, with Daniel lashing out at anyone who bothered him, so that he appeared to be a troublemaker. The coordinator discussed this with him each time, and he gradually learned to talk about what annoyed him, instead of lashing out at whoever was near. In summer school, there had been a volunteer for each small group, and Daniel had no trouble. Now he was with a mixed-age group of fifteen to twenty children, with as few as two adults at a time. The children were expected to assume much more responsibility for their behavior, and Daniel was obviously unable to at first, but was very able to understand the results of his lack of control.

Daniel's eye treatment ended in the late fall, and he wore his glasses continually. Other problems developed with him that worried the staff much more than his previous lack of control. His politeness became more of a caricature, so that he appeared obsequious and began to "yes mam" the staff continually. He also began to lie, at first occasionally, and gradually he seemed to lie more and more about everything and anything. He was obviously missing school a good deal because he had to baby sit, but told the school authorities that he was ill. It was the same pattern as in the former school, where everyone knew he lied about being ill, but apparently did not know why. So far as the study center staff was able to find out, neither school ever determined the reason for his absences. They both resented them and blamed his family. The mother was called several times, but was "unresponsive," according to both schools.

The staff decided that Daniel was reacting strongly to the continual demands on him to miss school and to lie about it.

He was not the only child of whom this was true, and it was a pattern for families to select the most capable child who obviously did well in school and could "afford to miss." In Daniel's case, although he did not do well in school by other's standards, he was the child of the family who did the best. The aunt was quick to explain her obvious need for him; the other children were too "unreliable" and he was the one who could be trusted.

The problems of several children who were regularly kept home to babysit were discussed with the social worker in the housing project. Daniel seemed to want very much to succeed in school and yet wanted to be "good" at home. Another younger child reacted as strongly, but in a different way. He would arrive at the center extremely pale, complaining of a headache and a feeling that he was going to vomit. The coordinator gradually realized that this happened only on days when he was kept home to babysit. When she asked him, "did you miss school today?", he would nod sadly.

The social worker offered to discuss both children with their families. In both cases, the mother of the younger boy and the aunt of Daniel who took care of him, were genuinely interested and unaware of the conflict in the children. Both appeared to have taken an easy way out of a situation, and they were certainly not unique in doing this. But in both cases, the intelligence and sensitivity of the boys seemed to make them react very strongly to the conflict. Other arrangements were made. Daniel no longer stayed home to babysit and his overly polite saccharine speech and the lying slowly disappeared. During the next year and a half, his attendance record at the center and at school were nearly perfect.

In April, Daniel scored an average of 7.3 on a reading test, a gain of seven months in ten months (including the summer months). His accuracy on the test had changed from "very low" to "very high," in fact to 100 per cent. He apparently did well on the school tests also, since he was moved near the end of the year to the top track--a move of three tracks. Daniel was now in the same class with his study center friends. At this time, his tutor left the center and tutoring was discontinued.

Daniel again attended the six weeks summer program at the study center, and entered eighth grade the next fall. His motivation and drive were impressive, shown by his desire to get as much as possible out of every opportunity and to willingly accept suggestions for use of his leisure time.

Daniel's attending the center was the result of a deliberate policy of the staff. While many self-referred children have been successful in centers, and school referrals are often good, perhaps the best single category of referrals has been "friends" of children already registered. At least in this center, where the children were mainly from the top track in school, the staff gradually preferred to ask the children to invite friends when there were openings for more children, rather than to ask the school for more names. During the years, a number of children were recruited in this way, all so successfully that the coordinator believes that the friends of capable, interested children are usually also capable, interested youngsters. If children can find friends like themselves and thereby support one another, they may have less trouble later on in school, when it becomes "square" to achieve and there are increased pressures from the neighborhood to join gangs and rebel.

Daniel is from a problem family, where both younger and older siblings have serious problems. One younger brother is well-known to the other children as a continual truant from school who smokes, drinks, and is said to sell "pot." Occasionally, one of them tries to tease Daniel about him, and Daniel completely ignores the teasing. He never mentions his family and seems very identified with the center and attached to the staff.

The biggest change in Daniel, according to the adults who know him, is that he became genuinely boyish, when he appeared before to be a caricature of a complying adult. He now appeared self assured, confident, and poised. By the time he was in eighth grade, no one could remember when he had his last fight.

Daniel's last reading score at the center, at mid-term in eighth grade, was 8.1. Although below the national average, it compares well with other top track students in his school. This was a normal gain of eight months in eight months, part of which were spent in the center's summer program.

At mid-term when Daniel was in the eighth grade, the study center was closed. Daniel had attended for one and a half years during the academic year, and for two summers. His grades in eighth grade this year are very good, and he will enter high school with a record that marks him as a high achiever. His former school record would have lowered his high school placement. The group of volunteers and the coordinator planned a series of monthly trips, to volunteer's homes and to places to interest in the city, with the group of children who attended the center until December of this last year. Daniel participates in these trips. He gives the impression of self-confidence and awareness of his abilities, and more determination to succeed than the majority of his group. His friendship group includes six other boys from the same top track class, who plan to enter high school together next fall. Daniel is a well accepted member of the group, with whom he spends most of his free time.

Roger

Roger, an intelligent Negro boy who attended a storefront tutoring center for three years, epitomizes the problems of the very capable youngster who grows up in a slum community. The case demonstrates that volunteer help has a crucial role in helping such a youngster realize at least some of his potentialities.

When Roger and his sister first came to the center in September during opening week, the staff immediately became aware of the fact that they were not typical. They were dressed much better than the other children of the neighborhood, they were most mannerly, and Roger's speech was completely articulate and adult in tone.

A big boned and large boy for his twelve years, Roger was very noticeable, and other children often commented on his size. He looked more like a high school student than a seventh grader, which he was. The storefront center was located in a large building complex, in which he lived. It was at that time an integrated building in which the families were more "middle class" than the rest of the immediate neighborhood. Roger and his sister attended a Catholic parochial school which was located outside of the neighborhood.

Roger was assigned to a retired telephone operator who was impressed with his ability to read. He selected a very difficult story and read it aloud. She noticed, however, that his voice was flat and toneless, and he ignored punctuation marks. It was unpleasant to listen to him read although he could read extremely well as far as pronouncing and understanding difficult material. The volunteer showed Roger a newspaper and they read some news and located the places mentioned on a globe. It was obvious that Roger had very little knowledge of the physical world. He had no idea where to look for countries or cities mentioned in the news. She suggested that he listen to radio commentators to see how they presented the news. The next week, Roger was anxious to read more news as the commentators did, and mimicked their styles. These activities and homework were continued until January, when the volunteer left to take a part-time night job.

Roger had taken a reading test in October and made an average score of 9.5, with all skills above his grade level of 7.1. When his first volunteer left, he was not assigned another because there were so many children much more in need of help. He brought his sister to the center each week, and read library books until she was finished with her lesson. Roger liked mystery books and accepted help in finding some to take home each week. He occasionally had homework, which did not seem difficult for him.

Not nearly as bright as Roger, the sister was barely able to achieve adequately. This was confirmed by study center tests and observations. Nevertheless, the school felt that she did not need academic help. She has remained with the same volunteer for three years, and gradually achieved better than average grades in school, with her reading test results at the center showing very average progress.

On the first day, the staff was informed that Roger's mother had died several years before. Gradually, the staff learned that the children were inseparable, and that Roger had a very protective attitude toward his sister. They slowly overcame their reticence enough to talk about their housekeeping efforts. The father, a college-educated minor civil servant, worked long hours and spent much of his little time at home sleeping. The children assumed a great deal of responsibility for the home and seemed proud of their work, although it did take much of their free time after school. Roger's sister talked of "good friends" at school, but neither child had any friends in the neighborhood. According to the staff, Roger was aloof from the boys his age at the center, who were poorly dressed and often gave the impression of being tough. His sister seemed oblivious to other children in the center. She was devoted to the adults, and over-eager to please them. Two years after she started to attend the center, a staff member reported that "she still falls all over herself when anyone pays attention to her. She is still pathetically eager for adult contact."

When the family moved out of the building complex, as the neighborhood was becoming more difficult and the buildings were deteriorating, the children reported that they were going to leave the center. The coordinator went to the home to talk to the father. He was not at home, and the children did not open the door, although they knew the coordinator. This is the only instance in several years of this kind of "middle-class" behavior in this neighborhood. All other children oepned the doors immediately when they recognized the voice of the coordinator, but these children were forbidden to let anyone in. The father came by the center the next day, and explained that he had thought the center was available only to children who lived in the building. He was assured that this was not so. The staff was certain that his concern was with "tough" element that came to the center. However, he said that Roger was having trouble with arithmetic and needed help. Roger's father also said that he would try to spend some time helping at the center. He was never able to, and obviously could not. However, he was the only parent in this center to express the wish that he could help.

Within two weeks, Roger was assigned to a metallurgical engineer, who was interested in helping with mathematics. This volunteer lived in the suburbs, and had tried for several weeks to help a boy who was failing in mathematics. However, the boy was irregular in attendance and seemed unmotivated to accept help. The volunteer immediately liked working with Roger, who was always prompt and most attentive.

The volunteer felt that Roger's background in mathematics was most deficient, and that it would take a long time commitment to help him. While Roger had some mechanical ability to attack problems--he knew some multiplication tables and facts about mathematics--he had no conception of any relationship between multiplication and division, for example. Most startling was the complete absence of any understanding of concepts of size or relationship of parts to wholes. This obviously bright boy did not know how to attack a simple jigsaw puzzle, except by sheer guesswork. They spent two hours once a week working on mathematics, starting with concepts that the volunteer considered most basic and which he felt that his own children had learned in suburban schools as early as the second grade. The lessons usually ended with a few minutes spent doing a jigsaw puzzle or playing a game. Often, they worked steadily for two hours, which was not possible with most students.

For a long time, Roger claimed to "hate mathematics" and seemed to have real resistance to learning it, but was always willing to work. Progress was slow, but always obvious.

In June, when the volunteer visited Roger's school, he found that Roger was failing in geography and would have to attend summer school, or be retained in seventh grade. At the same time that Roger was failing seventh grade because of this deficiency, he was retested in reading in June, by the center staff. His average score was 11.8 on a different form of the test that he had taken previously. Even for a very bright child, this was an impressive gain of two years and three months in eight months. Although he was not tutored in reading, there is no doubt that the extensive use of the library helped Roger. Each week, he was helped to find books that appealed to him, and he discussed what he read with various staff members. Until this volunteer started with Roger, he read mysteries almost exclusively. The volunteer found some interest in history, and encouraged this by providing Roger with historical fiction. He provided books for Roger until a year later, when Roger began to get his own from the school library.

During the summer, Roger attended summer school at the parochial school and continued to see his volunteer weekly for a two-hour session. They worked mainly on geography, but continued some work on math. The volunteer often commented on the emotional resistance that Roger seemed to have to math, but this was not true with geography. Like the previous one, this volunteer was impressed with the boy's total lack of knowledge about the physical world. He was willing to learn, and seemed to enjoy studying geography with a tutor, while accepting mathematics as necessary but much less appealing.

Roger was invited several times to the volunteer's home in the suburbs, and said that he would come, but never did. During the first summer of work with the volunteer, Roger met his two children, who were attending college, when they worked at the study center.

In the fall, Roger was promoted to eighth grade, and the volunteer continued to see him through that year, to work on mathematics. He reported that the eighth grade mathematics was primarily a review of earlier work, which was especially helpful to Roger. During the following summer, they continued to review and to introduce Roger to a beginning understanding of algebra. This had been done in his eighth grade mathematics, but the volunteer felt that Roger would have trouble in high school unless they worked together in the summer.

The next fall, Roger entered high school and still seemed to the volunteer to need help with the transition to high school work. They continued to work together until winter vacation, at which time the volunteer discontinued coming to the center. The volunteer had worked with Roger continuously once a week for two years, except for annual vacation trips out of the city. At the end of the first year of help, Roger confided to the coordinator that "math isn't half bad anymore," then quickly and politely changed it to "not bad at all." He was quite definite, after two years, that it was no longer a problem, and "I don't even hate it anymore."

Roger remained a "loner" at the center for nearly three years. Attempts of the volunteers to draw him into activities with other children resulted in politeness on both sides, but apparent tolerance. During the first year, when both Negro and white children attended the center, there was no conflict and the white children looked as tough and poorly dressed as the Negro ones. Roger and his sister were obvious "outsiders" in such a center, as they were in the neighborhood. Confined to their home except during school hours, their main contact with the neighborhood was through the study center. The only success of the staff in involving them in other activities was the sister's participation in a program at the local YMCA. Unlike his sister, Roger never spoke of "good friends," nor was he ever seen with anyone except his sister, until about the time that his volunteer left the center. At this time, Roger began to appear with a new friend whom he introduced to the staff. The friend was already known to one staff member as a boy who was "amazingly like Roger." A top student in the local public high school, he was also known to have been a complete loner, until he and Roger found each other. Now six months later, they are often together.

By ordinary standards of tutoring projects, Roger would not qualify. Only after he had flunked a course would he ordinarily have appealed for help. But because his father knew that he was having trouble with mathematics, despite the school's repeated assurances that he did not need academic help, a volunteer was found for him. The volunteer was obviously ideal for this boy; he and Roger immediately related well. Although Roger disliked mathematics, as he was quick to make known, he was always impressed with the ability of the volunteer. The fact that the volunteer used this knowledge in his own professional work certainly must have made the help more meaningful.

The main impression of Roger remained one of reticence. After three years at the center, his conversation with most adults was limited to a polite "yes mam" or "no sir." The few staff members with whom he talked more freely were those who have known him continuously during the three years period. They all agreed that Roger had a very fine sense of humor, which they became aware of only after they got to know him. Roger has never been known to "clown" or react to attempts of other children to involve him in nonsense. On one occasion, when he thought no one was near, he leaned over and placed a large globe on his back, as though leaning under its weight. When he saw the coordinator approach, he smiled and replaced the globe on the table.

In many ways, Roger is still burdened with a job beyond his years. But with more assured success in school, a friend his age, and knowledge of several adults who are interested and available to him should he need help, Roger is performing well in high school. The fact that his physical size is no longer a problem to him may also be important. The rapid growth of three years ago is over, and his size no longer unusual for his age.

If it were not for the tutoring project, it is doubtful that Roger would have received the necessary individual help. The attitude of his school seemed to be that he could get the work if he just tried. With Roger's reticence that could at first appear to be disinterest and coldness, it is most unlikely that he would make the first move to get help for himself. His bringing his sister to the center for several months when he did not see a volunteer gave him some extra non-threatening contact with the staff.

Roger continued to be aloof, and he and his sister will always appear deviate in their neighborhood. When a group of children discussed what they would do if they had a "lot of money," he remained thoughtful and quiet during the entire discussion. His little sister startled the group by saying quietly, "I would get some of those pictures, like people have on their walls."

Roger's father has always planned to send his children to college. If Roger had failed seventh grade as threatened, the result could have been tragic. Without remedial help in mathematics and some understanding of its usefulness, Roger would have struggled through high school, lowered his aspirations, or possibly, given up.

Cornelia

Cornelia registered at the storefront center in October, during the first week of operation. She appeared with four siblings. Since at that center children came by families, they often became identified by family characteristics. Cornelia and her siblings were early identified as chronic pouters, pushy children who "knew what they wanted and demanded it," and who were very competitive with each other and with other children.

Cornelia was nine years old and in the fourth grade of public school. The teacher said she was a good student, whose reading score of 2.5 from the previous May was probably inaccurate since she seemed to read better than that. She always finished her work, but never seemed able to work up to her real ability, which seemed to be normal. She especially needed help in phonics. When tested by the study center, Cornelia scored 3.2 on a test designed for children in the first half of third grade. She was therefore, even on a test that should have been relatively easy for her, about a year retarded in reading by the fourth grade.

Cornelia was assigned to a young college student who, until she became ill, worked with her from October until February. The volunteer wrote limited accounts of her contacts with Cornelia, and worked on reading activities suggested by the staff. It was impossible to schedule the children's appointments on the same evening, so they came as a group every time one of them had an appointment. At first this presented no problem, since they could read or quietly wait for each other. However, as they became more familiar with the center, like many other children they became more demanding and boisterous. Fortunately, they were all assigned to volunteers, and were gradually able to accept the idea that they could not continually interfere in the lessons of other children. The continual demonstration of the staff that no one could interfere in their tutoring session probably did more than anything else to put the idea across.

After four months, the children were allowed to come to the center only on their appointed evenings. If other members of the family accompanied them, usually their behavior was no longer a problem. Cornelia's behavior became increasingly difficult, however, as she became more aware of the other children. She could not resist a taunt when someone walked past the table at which she was working, nor could she resist "flaring" up when a child walked by and made any kind of remark. When asked about her behavior, her answer was the standard one of many children, "He (or she) mess with me." Every observer agreed that Cornelia actually provoked each incident in some way, but this was vehemently denied or Cornelia would withdraw and become sulky.

Unfortunately, Cornelia's volunteer became ill in February. She came one evening a week with her roommate, and they both were ill. When she recovered from pneumonia, she called to say that she would wait until her roommate was also completely recovered. The staff tried many times to reach her, but without success.

Cornelia still came one evening a week. At first, she was perfectly willing to accept the illness, although she came each week hoping to find her volunteer returned. The coordinator helped her with homework, or let her read. Gradually, Cornelia became increasingly unhappy and would loudly demand a new volunteer. At other times, the staff would observe her standing on the street near the center quietly crying. Finally in March, the center was able to reach the volunteer by phone. (The phone had been disconnected for some time.) She said she was "too embarrassed to return." She refused to talk to Cornelia by phone.

It was not possible to assign another volunteer to Cornelia until April. She was attached to the coordinator, and had been coming by irregularly to find out when another tutor was available. Finally a young court reporter who had tried to work with an older girl, who was irregular in attendance, said she was "let down and discouraged," and asked for a new student. Cornelia was assigned to her.

It seemed to the staff that both Cornelia and her new tutor were quite apprehensive at the first meeting. Despite assurances, the volunteer seemed to feel that she had somehow failed with the first girl. Cornelia had showed by her reactions just how badly she felt about being let down by an adult.

Because of a change in center policy, Cornelia had a one and a half hour appointment once a week. Her previous volunteer had seen her for forty-five minutes and then had worked with another child. The first meeting was described in detail by the volunteer. She reported that "Cornelia is a very quiet, apprehensive child." (Later it must have seemed to her that the child she saw the first evening could not be the same girl with whom she worked.)

Other volunteers who observed the children had other reactions. Cornelia was always identified as a typical member of her family group. On one occasion when the staff discussed the personality problems of the children, one young man jokingly mentioned that he "felt sorry for the guy Cornelia ever marries."

However, the first lesson with a new volunteer went very well. Cornelia read willingly, but so rapidly that she made many mistakes. She "misread" small words, and read as rapidly as she could, as if under pressure to perform. When the volunteer suggested that she slow down, she did and the reading improved. She confided to the volunteer that her teacher had taken away her reader that day, and put her with a lower group. The volunteer asked if she would like to bring her reader so they could read at the center. Cornelia said she would like to. Cornelia confided that what worried her most about school was arithmetic, and she showed the volunteer the kinds of problems they were doing. The rest of the evening was spent on arithmetic.

When the volunteer told Cornelia about herself, Cornelia specifically asked about her age. Finding that it was the same, in the early twenties, as her mother, she expressed surprise that the volunteer had no children while her mother had five. Cornelia mentioned an extended family of relatives, all female, and made no mention of her father.

At the end of the lesson, Cornelia walked to the library shelves and selected two books and checked them out. They were both arithmetic textbooks. She walked back to tell her volunteer goodbye, suddenly grabbed her hand and squeezed it hard, then hurried out of the center.

Cornelia brought her reader the next week, but never after that time. She reviewed phonics with a workbook. Her speech difficulties were obvious since she could not identify sounds very well. She would quickly guess, mispronounce and often try to cover up her deficiencies. She liked all activities about reading, but gradually showed increased resistance to reading itself. Before beginning, she would examine each selection carefully to see how long it was. Her attitude toward learning, when this could be done through activities, was in direct contrast to the attitude showed when she was expected to read. Then there was a tremendous drive toward perfection, and she was easily upset by mistakes.

At the end of the second lesson, Cornelia and the volunteer played a game of bingo. Cornelia's older sister walked over and joined them. Cornelia seemed at first very accepting of the idea, but a moment later, jumped up and defiantly said "ok, let's settle it. Who are you seein', me or my sister?" The volunteer assured her that she was her volunteer and her sister would remain with her own in the future. This was the first outburst with the new volunteer and despite all she had heard of Cornelia, she was shocked by the intensity and anger.

All books were refused by Cornelia for several months.

She would select any short section of programmed material or stories in a workbook in preference. But one day she discovered that books can also have short selections, and this was quite a revelation to her. She discovered an article about crabs in a big book, began to read it because of the enticing illustrations, and then became so interested that she stayed late to finish the material.

In June, Cornelia was tested, her score had gone up to 4.3, a gain of eleven months in eight months.

During the summer, Cornelia continued to see the volunteer weekly, except for a month when the volunteer was on vacation. Cornelia learned to knit. In this activity, as with various craft projects, Cornelia showed herself to be an alert and excellent student. This discrepancy runs like a thread throughout the reports. Whenever Cornelia engeged in activities that were not strictly "academic," she learned very quickly. She could work on crossword puzzles for a long period of time. Like many other children, she had not seen one before and was at first amazed at the results. Any time that the work could be in activity form, the volunteer reported Cornelia's alertness and inquisitiveness. This was in contrast to the mentions of reading and arithmetic, when Cornelia wanted every answer correct the first time and had no tolerance with herself to correct mistakes. She fluctuated between rapid guessing and halting hesitation.

During the summer vacation while the lessons continued, Cornelia knitted slippers for her mother. She made a wastebasket for her room, covering a container with contact paper and decorating it with a fringe. She covered various boxes with contact paper, as containers for her own possessions and those of her family. Her patience and willingness to stick with a job were impressive--as impressive as her inability to do a long academic assignment. The lessons were geared to her needs, with academic work in small doses interspersed with other activities.

The volunteer took Cornelia on several outings during the summer. She was inquisitive and alert in asking about the Loop, one of their first trips. It was her first trip there, and she proudly pointed out buildings as they drove back towards home. When another volunteer and siblings of Cornelia's accompanied them, she seemed alternatively withdrawn and aggressive. Group trips with a number of children were not as successful, although Cornelia had her volunteer to herself. The sheer presence of other children seemed threatening.

One Saturday morning during the summer, the volunteer was startled to have Cornelia and her siblings appear at the door of her apartment, some eighteen blocks from their home. She was even more startled when they explained how they found her, because it was obvious that they had no idea where they were going and had wandered around for quite a while. She told them it was nice to see them, but they must call the next time, to make sure she was home. She gave them cold drinks, and a little later took them home by car. She was quite concerned about a main highway they had to cross and one very tough neighborhood they had walked through. Although it was not until Christmas vacation that Cornelia was invited and driven to the volunteer's home, she never again attempted to walk there.

During the fall, Cornelia began to write short selections for the center newspaper and for school assignments. Children's magazines and short selections continued to appeal to her as reading material, and she especially enjoyed activities with words and sentences. The delight of most study center children in work which they can do without fear of mistake is impressive, and Cornelia especially showed this. When rapidly filling in crossword puzzles that were easy for her, an adult said "those are pretty easy for you, aren't they?" Cornelia's answer was "and you don't know how fun it is."

In December, Cornelia was given a test appropriate for her fifth grade level, a survey that covers from middle third grade into high school work. Despite careful instruction, Cornelia tried to do high school level work and scored only 4.2 on the test. However, for the first time, she was able to go over the test and showed that she understood and could correct her errors up to the point that the work became too difficult for her. There was no doubt that her reading was actually somewhat better than her score would indicate, but the test was typical of her lack of patience or ability to concentrate on straight academic work. However, it confirmed the easier test which showed that she had mastered the basic skills of reading.

Cornelia's school had started after-school reading classes for children, and it was suggested that she ask about being included. Her answer was a definite "no." The lessons at the center continued with homework assignments and various attempts to make reading more palatable to Cornelia. She would read willingly, so long as the selections were short. By January, the volunteer reported that

Cornelia's attitude toward reading was "slightly improved." This was especially true when the volunteer provided simple animal stories or fairy tales.

Cornelia's fatigue was often discussed with her, because it was obvious that she was tired. Her bedtime since the age of nine when she first came to the center was 11:30 P.M., and she got up at 7:30 A.M. Some of the children became concerned enough about their school achievement that they discussed this problem and made honest efforts to get more rest; Cornelia never admitted that it was a problem.

Center contacts with her mother were very limited. The volunteers all met the mother when they took the children on outings, and although she was polite, she seemed very threatened and uneasy whenever one came to the home. From the other children's school referrals, it was obvious that the school felt that this mother taught her children to "fight for what they wanted" and seemed to instill hostility toward the whole outside world. The mother used her maiden name; this was unique among the families who attended the center. Her children seemed an exaggerated caricature of attitudes shown by other children.

In March, Cornelia reported that she had a long geography project to do, involving a report from encyclopedias. She had written a number of short assignments, making a first draft and then correcting them and rewriting. When the volunteer asked if she would like to try to write this report in her own words, she thought she would. The encyclopedias were difficult for Cornelia to understand,

and at first, it seemed impossible for her to translate the material into her own words. The volunteer spent time explaining the material and talking about it. For the next two months, most of the lesson time was devoted to this project. Both the volunteer and Cornelia became discouraged and it seemed at times not worth the tremendous effort. The experience of writing, instead of copying from an encyclopedia, seemed a completely new experience. Cornelia insisted that she wanted to finish, while finding it extremely difficult to work. Only with the volunteer's persistence and continual support was she finally able to finish, and her pride was enormous. She made a point of telling her teacher that the report was entirely her own work.

Cornelia's grades were consistently good during that year, and she proudly brought in her report card several times. Occasional trips continued, which were obviously enjoyed by Cornelia, and during which she asked many questions. During the Christmas holiday, Cornelia went to the volunteer's home to bake cookies for the center party. The volunteer reported that she felt "closest to Cornelia" in this activity.

At about this time, the staff was asked to select the children who seemed typical of the center population. They selected Cornelia, who seemed to have most of the problems that other children had. Her progress in getting along with others in the center was impressive, although she reverted to "stubborness and restlessness" when her tutor's vacation time came near. She was much more tolerant of other children, however, and could now work without many "flare-ups" or problems of thinking that other children interfered if they walked near her.

The project coordinator had never talked with Cornelia at length. On one visit to the center, Cornelia joined in on a discussion of the history of the center. She remembered her first tutor, and just how long she had been seeing the second one. She agreed with other children that one difference in the center was its quietness, and became quite vehement about the problem of working in school. The project coordinator went over later to talk to her privately with her volunteer.

A great deal had been written about this child, and many people knew her well. No one had ever mentioned that, in a center of predominantly poorly dressed and rather tough-appearing children, Cornelia appeared among the toughest. It was not so much her clothes, which were typical--everyday slacks and blouse--but that they were unironed and dirty. A scar on her cheek, and a very dirty face accented her belligerence.

The coordinator thanked Cornelia for joining in the discussion and said that she was pleased to see reports that her grades were so good this year. How was school? Cornelia looked momentarily pleased and then muttered something about hating school. The coordinator said "tell me about it" and Cornelia blasted off for five minutes without pause. She berated her teacher, the teachers of her friends and siblings, claiming that the only nice teacher she ever had was in kindergarten and the teacher was so mean now in fourth grade. The volunteer sat in amazement at this outburst. When she paused, the coordinator said, "how is the teacher mean?" Again, instantly, a long garbled account of how she was in continual trouble because of another girl, but "the teacher always blame me--not her." The coordinator told her that, while we really aren't interested in the teachers of other children because she doesn't need to worry about them, it's very important that she talk to her volunteer about her own teacher. It must make life very difficult when she has to be in school for hours every day, and feels that way. Some children even like their teachers--that helps a lot. Others don't but they find ways to make the best of it. What would happen if she moved away from the girl who bugs her? What would happen if she just didn't sit beside her, or stand near her? (Some of the incidents took place in the hall, walking together and others in the room, when they were at their desks). Cornelia said "don't know" and was told that she should think about it. Most important, she must continue to talk to the volunteer about these problems. The volunteer could help her figure out what she could do to make life more pleasant in school. Each time the adult spoke, Cornelia listened attentively, but seemed to be concentrating on her thoughts, and would again begin with a repetition of the same difficulties. The volunteer was visibly upset by Cornelia's anger. Because of her experience at the center being limited to two children, she had no way of knowing that this was an extreme reaction. Whatever problems Cornelia ever showed seemed valid ones to the rest of the staff. They were very much those of study center children. Their selecting her as typical of all those problems was valid, except that she certainly was more vehement and more articulate than most. The expenditure of energy was impressive, because she did not so much talk as explode. Both adults felt afterwards that Cornelia was so involved in her own troubles that she may not even have heard the suggestions of the coordinator, but the volunteer planned to continue to try to discuss these feelings with Cornelia.

The next week, Cornelia immediately informed her tutor that she had been moved away from the girl who bothered her. She had some further complaints about the teacher, but in the midst of them, suddenly made one nice remark about her. This was nearly as startling as her former outburst. Cornelia never again spoke with such vehemence or anger. She was probably more out-spoken with another adult than she would have been with her own volunteer, whom she was most eager to please. However, she was willing to go on discussing her attempts to get along in school.

In June, Cornelia averaged 4.6 on a test, showing a four months' gain in six months. When the volunteer suggested that Cornelia ought to attend summer school, she was not definitely opposed as she had been in the case of after-school reading classes, but was non-committal. It was not until the middle of the summer that she told the volunteer she was in summer school and "liked her teacher." The fact that it was a new school, not her regular one, seemed important to Cornelia. Despite the fact that summer school was held in a school with a "tough" reputation so that several parents objected to their children attending, Cornelia talked of her "nice teacher" and the "nice school." It was obvious from her comments that she had heard and understood everything that was said about her own participation in her former troubles, even when she had seemed too angry to be listening.

In the fall of 1967 when Cornelia entered sixth grade, she seemed to start off the new year quite well. According to her volunteer, she was "still too hard on herself in some ways. It was still hard for her to make mistakes, or to admit them." But "there were signs that she realized that every word or problem was not a matter of life and death, and she began to comment about her own problem of getting too upset about little things."

While the regular volunteer found Cornelia very changed in her ability to relax and discuss problems, in her work and in her ability to get along with other children, a substitute who saw Cornelia twice during the summer when her volunteer was away, reported that her attitude and behavior were "poor--she is stubborn and there is rivalry between her and her sister." Apparently, Cornelia still reacted with anger and disappointment when the volunteer was gone. She still needed her support very much.

While Cornelia's anger was very impressive, so was her energy. The volunteer felt that if Cornelia could only make use of this energy constructively, she could do well. The one characteristic of study center children that Cornelia did not share was apathy, although she could appear most apathetic about academic work. However, her intense interest and involvement in anything not strictly academic kept reminding the volunteer that this child could be motivated and eager, if only the right approach and materials could be found. This conviction kept boosting the volunteer's morale in the face of increased hostility to reading and arithmetic, and enabled her to keep hoping that eventually this interest and eagerness would extend to school.

In December, Cornelia's average score was 4.3, a loss of three months in six. She completely failed in the third section of the test, and complained that she was "tired." Her work in school seemed much improved, however, and her attitude, from her remarks about school, seemed better. Her grades on her report card showed steady improvement through the year.

When she brought in her report card for the first time six months after joining the center, her grades were all poor except for spelling, in which she received an A. The tutor saw several report cards after this time, and noted a steady improvement as the "unsatisfactory" marks were replaced by better grades and there were less subjects in which it was noted that Cornelia could improve. After the summer school experience, and a better beginning in sixth grade, there were no more unsatisfactory marks.

Cornelia was rather defiant about the test taken in December, reminiscent of her former attitude toward school. She was making obvious progress in school and was proud of it. Never had she done such a half-hearted, poor job on a test and she was angry when asked about it. On the first part of the test which was based on speed, she made more than a year's gain and achieved 100 per cent accuracy, far better than she had ever done. The next part was vocabulary which she did adequately, equalling her former score. However, she insisted on "getting it over with" and took a third part the same evening, which children did not usually do. She very carelessly hurried through that part of the test on comprehension exercises and this lowered her average. It was almost as if Cornelia had to express hostility somewhere, and since the school no longer served this purpose, it was directed against the center and its tests. It was decided not to retest her until the end of the next semester, because despite the low score, she was obviously making progress in school, which was the real concern of the center.

Cornelia's anger and hostility toward school were most unusual. Among the children of our centers she was one of a very few who seemed to have such deep feelings against school and teachers. It was obviously a reflection from home, from a mother who seemed upset by having anyone come to the home. The literature about deprived children describes this alienation and hostility as typical. Our experience was the opposite. Alienated, hostile children in elementary schools were the exception, even among the problem families served by this center. Of course, the really alienated ones would be reluctant to come to the center voluntarily. The school claimed, however, that this center did have the problem children of the school and even among them, Cornelia was a deviate in her excessive need to lash out and to complain about school and teachers. She was the angriest child the staff encountered in several years of working with children. She was also one of a distinct minority who expressed such emotions sbout school and teachers.

Annette

Annette was ten years old, in the fourth grade, when her aunt brought her to the storefront study center in January of 1965 (grade placement 4.4). The aunt said that she was referred there by the school, which was a distance from the center and from which no other referrals had been solicited or received. The aunt and Annette lived alone in a housing project about a mile from the center. Annette was said by her aunt to have trouble in reading. A referral form was sent to the school and Annette assigned to a Negro housewife. When tested during the first couple of weeks at the center, Annette scored an average of 3.9 on a test designed for third graders. Her score on the comprehension part of the test, which involved following specific instructions, was a year lower than her vocabulary score.

At her second lesson, the volunteer reported that "Annette said that her aunt did not want the school to know that she comes here for help." Despite the record which stated that the aunt was referred by the school, the volunteer seemed to believe Annette. This was the only one of Annette's stories reported by the volunteer, but she mentioned that Annette told her many.

When the school referral was received, Annette's reading average was given as a "C." The school report said that she was of good average intelligence, but often showed no curiosity or interest whatsoever in her school work. They specifically recommended help in word attack skills. The aunt with whom she lived was "over protective, insisted on walking her to and from school, which caused her to be teased by the other children,"and "came to the school about every little thing that went wrong with Annette."

Annette seemed very shy, but willing to work and eager for help. The volunteer worked with her homework in arithmetic and used a phonics review workbook. The aunt would bring Annette to the center and then return to meet her after her lesson an hour later. During the first several weeks, Annette gradually became more nervous and when her aunt did not appear on time one evening, the coordinator walked out with her and saw Annette's aunt walking unsteadily out of a tavern. Annette seemed very embarrassed. The next week, Annette confided to the coordinator that she could not concentrate, since she was worried that her aunt would get sick and need her.

When Annette came to the center the following week with her aunt, she was asked if she would like to visit the center while Annette had her lessons. She seemed very pleased with the idea and was offered magazines and books. Sometimes she read to a smaller child, or invited him to sit with her and color at the table where she sat. Younger siblings sometimes accompanied the children, who had to babysit with them. Annette seemed to no longer worry about her aunt.

Annette expressed concern about her homework, and this seemed strange to the volunteer since she seemed to have no serious trouble with it on the evening that she attended the center. Finally, Annette showed her several homework papers, that had very low grades. It was obvious to the volunteer that answers had been erased on the paper and written in again. Annette became quite embarrassed, but then she told the volunteer that after she finished her homework, her aunt always went over it and changed some of the answers. These were wrong, but she did not know what to do about it. The volunteer asked the coordinator to come to the table where she and Annette worked, and they showed the coordinator the papers. The coordinator later talked to the aunt about homework, expressing appreciation for her interest in Annette's work, but explaining that the school wanted Annette to do her own work completely, by herself. If she saw that Annette had time and encouragement to do it, and finished it, that was the limit of her responsibility. It was very important for Annette to learn to be independent about this. The aunt suggested that she had a hard time admitting that Annette was a big girl, and if the center thought it was important, she would surely do as they wished. Annette continued to show her homework papers to the volunteer, and there was no longer a problem of very poor grades or lots of errors. It seemd so obvious to the staff that answers had been erased and written in by a different hand writing, that any teacher would have questioned it, but since the school apparently considered the aunt a nuisance, perhaps they had preferred not to become involved with this problem.

The first volunteer left suddenly at the end of March, because of illness in the family. She had been a very faithful volunteer, but had often commented on the strong attachment Annette had for her. She claimed to be worried about this deep attachment, and felt that she could never leave the child, since Annette claimed she wanted no other volunteer. Annette seemed very shy, but was known to a number of staff members and the coordinator. She seemed appealing to everyone who attended that evening. They were aware of her concern about her aunt, and her record of perfect attendance at the center. Staff members often commented on her obvious loneliness and referred to her as a child who "needed a friend more than she needed academic help." Her record indicated that she needed as much academic help as many other children in the center, but she was the only child of whom the staff continually commented about her loneliness. Since most of the children attended a neighborhood school and therefore knew each other, or attended by families, Annette would have been an exception even if she had not been naturally shy.

When the first volunteer left, Annette was reassigned to a single white woman in her thirties, who worked as a statistical clerk. She continued to see Annette once a week for three years, and still continues at the time of this report.

Since volunteers are not all knowledgeable about children and gifted in planning original materials for them, this case illustrates the fact that even those volunteers who are not impressive in their performance can, nevertheless, make a contribution.

The volunteer's first efforts to help Annette involved letting her use the typewriter. But her reasons, unlike that of most volunteers in simply saying that it was a tool to make learning more pleasant, were recorded as "teaching her to type, so that she will have an ace in the hole in terms of job opportunities." This hope was, so far as the staff knew, not expressed to the child. Obviously a ten year old child is not likely to learn to "type" by being given turns on a typewriter one evening a week. When Annette tired of the typewriter, the volunteer was perfectly willing to let her do other things.

Despite sharing the orientation of other volunteers, and hearing of their experiences, this volunteer continually used her own ideas as guides for tutoring. She more than other volunteers, complained about Annette's lack of interest in academic work, but this was always defined as lack of curiosity, usually mentioned as a "lack of curiosity about words." Much of their time was spent in quite standard exercises of vocabulary building, with emphasis on Annette's using a dictionary to find out meanings she did not know. Although it was obvious that Annette did not seem to know the meaning even after looking in the dictionary, the volunteer never accepted this fact. She felt that it was the most important activity for them.

In July, Annette raised her reading score by nine months from the score of six months before. More important, the gain was almost entirely in the one area in which she had been weak--that of comprehension and following instructions. Obviously, the attention to words and their meanings, mechanical as it may have appeared, did pay off.

On Annette's report cards during the first year, her grades ranged from A to C, with poor marks in conduct. Reading, for some reason, was marked "above average." The next fall, her grades were worse, but conduct was markedly better. The new teacher reported a reading score of 3.3 from the previous March, compared to center scores of 3.9 (or 4.8 on an easier test than her grade level would justify). She was now in the fifth grade.

When the coordinator went to the homes to register the children in the fall, Annette not only knew what the date was that the center opened, which few children did, but had been marking the days off on a calender since the summer program ended. That summer, she had continued to see her volunteer every week, and the emphasis was on more games and activities since there was no homework.

In October, Annette was given a reading test appropriate for her grade level, one which ranged from middle third grade into high school work. She averaged 4.9, almost the same that she had on the previous test in the spring. During the year, her grades slowly improved, and she regularly brought in her report card to show to the staff.

The aunt continued to accompany Annette, and if there were no young children who needed someone to read to them or sit with them, she often sat with a group who were doing homework. Children came only by appointments to the center, but when they had special assignments and needed the use of encyclopedias, they were allowed to come in to use them. She spent most of the time reading. When asked if Annette had a library card, she seemed interested. She was helped to fill out the forms and told where the public library was a block from the center. It seemed a welcome idea to her, and a new activity that she and Annette could enjoy.

From observing the center in action, the aunt was apparently influenced in the choice of gifts for Annette for holidays and special occasions. Annette often brought games and magazines to the center to show, and these were similar to materials used there. She was the only child at the center known to receive the better children's magazines and worthwhile games. This was apparently a result of the aunt's learning about them.

In December, Annette's test showed an eight month gain in six months. In February, her teacher reported that her score on school reading tests had gone up nine months in the last academic year and that in arithmetic, which was her best subject, she was nearly at grade level for the first time. Although she had usually received A's in arithmetic, she still tested about six months behind in this skill by standardized tests given by the school. Arithmetic was always used at the center, because each new step in school concerned Annette, and she always wanted to be helped with it. Often, it was her retreat from reading activities, since she felt quite competent in it.

In the spring of that year, when Annette was in sixth grade, she confided to the volunteer that she was reading a sixth grade reader in school. She claimed that it was the first time that she had read a book at her grade level. She had always before read at a lower level than her grade level.

Annette continued to see her volunteer through the rest of sixth grade and during the following summer. During the school year, Annette always brought homework and talked about what the class was learning in arithmetic. She always wanted to show the volunteer the kind of work they were having, often just seeming to want assurance that she did understand it. In addition to homework, she always read from programmed reading materials or her own selections from anthologies of stories and poems. She was not interested enough to take home books, but neither did the volunteer make efforts to interest her in them.

When Annette returned in the fall when she entered seventh grade, a five year old boy cousin accompanied her and the aunt. He lived some distance away, but spent that one night with them. The aunt read to him, and watched him color at the homework table. Annette wanted to include him in the lessons too, and while she worked on an assignment, she wanted the volunteer to help him. The volunteer began to teach him the alphabet, which was not what most of the volunteers would have attempted. They knew that this was not the only way, or even the best way, to begin.

Again, despite orientation and availability of help in working with the children, the volunteer simply decided that she could help the boy and that he needed to learn the alphabet. When afterwards asked by a supervisor why she began work with him, she explained that she felt able to and wanted to. She said "apparently the aunt wants two kids educated for the price of one." The better volunteers did not see themselves so much in the role of teachers, but this is obviously the way she looked at her job, and her self-assurance was obvious.

In December, Annette's average was 7.1, a gain of fifteen months from the previous December. For the first time, her score averaged the same number as her grade placement, which was now 7.3. This seemed to please her very much. To be in seventh grade, and have a score that began with "7" did not go unnoticed. She was able to show her pleasure and continued to report progress at school.

It is a tremendous commitment for a volunteer to see the same child, week in and week out, for three years. However, the volunteer has never described Annette as do other volunteers, as neat or attractive. The reports are brief and matter-of-fact. The problem was always defined as Annette's lack of interest in doing better, and the aunt several times was criticized for restricting severely the ambitions of this child. There seems a genuine lack of respect for what both Annette and the aunt have achieved. The volunteer seems rather prim, self assured, and self righteous in her judgments. Yet she genuinely likes Annette, and Annette seems to know this.

The volunteer's main virtue is her consistency. She reports showing Annette a variety of materials. If the materials are the names and dates of the U.S. Presidents, and Annette does not know them, it seems obvious to the volunteer that "the schools do not teach this or that Annette is lacking in curiosity." That her suggestions may be irrelevant and her choice of materials poor, simply never occurs to the volunteer. Yet the eagerness of Annette for help and the fact that she brought so many questions about her homework and schoolwork obviously made the lessons meaningful for them both.

Mark

Mark was referred to the homework center in a public housing project with a group of sixth graders from the top track of the local public school in February. It was assumed that these children did not need the after-school reading classes newly offered by the school. Like the rest of the group, Mark was twelve years old and had not failed in school. When tested at the center in March, his average reading score was found to be 5.3, which compared to his grade placement of 6.6 meant that he was thirteen months retarded in reading. Of the eighteen children in the group, eight tested below grade level, ranging from five months to sixteen months retardation. Mark was the only boy in this group of eight. The others with low scores were all girls.

During more than two years that Mark attended the center, he was described differently by various staff members. The coordinator, who saw him four days a week, often referred to him as a "handsome boy." Other regular staff members considered him "good looking, and pleasant only when alone. Difficult in groups. The only child who was often rude to other children." He was a child who could never be missed, or overlooked, because he made his presence known.

From the first day at the center, Mark appeared to be a restless child. He could work on homework, or assignments given him by the center staff, but once these were finished, he seemed at a loss. He was loud, boisterous, and demanding. The children worked on various activities after the homework was finished. Mark had trouble settling down to an activity and would tend to walk around disrupting or trying to dominate groups of children. It was often a pattern for the coordinator to intervene, but then Mark would behave quite well for the rest of the afternoon. Each day, he showed the same pattern of disrupting other children until told to stop. He particularly liked to be given jobs to do, and seemed much more than the other children to need specific suggestions of what to do. Let alone, he could only cause trouble. This pattern very gradually changed, so that within three months, Mark was able to get along for several days at a time without difficulty.

The other children were drawn to Mark and often listened to him, even while rejecting his misbehavior by appealing to the staff to stop him from bothering them.

In April, a once-a-week tutoring program was started and Mark was assigned a volunteer. He seemed eager for this help, but could not manage to come regularly. When his mother was called, her reaction was completely different from the other mothers. They always expressed appreciation for the phone calls. Mark's mother sounded very tired, and helpless. She never knew where Mark was, and seemed surprised that she should be asked. He would later report that he "had a basketball game" or some other excuse which seemed rather doubtful. He had no trouble remembering the afternoon hours at the center, and attended regularly. It was obvious that he had more freedom than the other children in being away from home in the evenings. After several weeks of forgetting to attend the evening program, the coordinator called the mother to say that they would have to assign another child unless Mark would attend regularly. The mother said, "oh, Mark's here. I'll ask him." She asked him if he wanted to attend the evening program and he apparently said no; she accepted this as final. While other mothers often asked for help in interesting children in the program, she was the only one in our experience at this center who left the decision completely up to her son. (The coordinator had made a special effort to recruit a man tutor--the only one in the program--for Mark. After promising to come, the man was suddenly transferred to another office and never called to explain his disappearance. The group was originally composed of Negro and white women. One of the supervisors, a white man, was recruited with their help. If he had come, Mark would have been the only child assigned to a man, but he was the only older boy who seemed to obviously need more academic help than the afternoon homework program.)

Mark began to swear at the center, and the other children complained. None of the other children swore or used "dirty language" as the children claimed he did. When the coordinator discussed this with him, he seemed surprised when she told him that she also knew the words, but chose not to use such words at the center. Asked what he would think about a teacher who talked this way in school, he insisted that his does, "all the time." He repeated the words and phrases the teacher used. He had a man teacher who was known to use a great deal of physical force. The coordinator could only say that she considered it inappropriate, if the teacher talked this way. The fact was that the children at the center found this kind of talk offensive, and he had no right to impose it on them. Soon after this, Mark brought pornographic pictures to the center, and again managed to create a disturbance. The coordinator again talked to him, and he put the pictures away. He went to another room to join several friends of his in a game. The volunteer in this room happened to be a housewife who had been a registered nurse. During the game, one of the boys mentioned that Mark had "gotten into trouble with his pictures, but I saw them." Mark said one boy had used the word "penis" and he did not know what it meant. The volunteer explained the term, and then got the encyclopedia from the library and showed the group pictures of male and female anatomy. Mark was by far the least knowledgeable of the boys, and the children seemed aware of this. Each time the volunteer told them a term for a part of the body, she suggested that they must have their own terms. The boys would whisper and compare notes, and assure her that they did. They would not tell her their terms, but were interested in learning the right names for the parts of the body. The boys all had some minimum information except for Mark, although they were all interested in the discussion. Mark asked what men and women "do in bed, when they jump around naked." Some knew of the word "intercourse," which the volunteer explained. Mark had never heard of it.

Unlike many of the children who did not have fathers, Mark had one who died suddenly of a heart attack three years before he started coming to the study center. The oldest of seven children, he was once reported by the mother to have been very close to his father. The father had steady employment and the family income was considerably higher when he was alive. The mother always seemed tired and overwhelmed with her job with the younger children, and seemed to not have time to worry about Mark. He was the only child in the family given complete independence of hours, and thereby pushed into maturity.

Mark mentioned his father only once in a discussion started by the other children in regard to discipline. He told how his father "used to make me behave" and recounted one beating in detail, as if it were a happy memory. Ordinarily he bragged about his unusual freedom in comparison to the other children, but on one occasion, he mentioned that a particular boy, one of the brightest in the center, "has to be home by 6:00 P.M." He mentioned it almost with reverence, and added that "me--I can stay out all night." The other boy was one whom he especially liked.

Despite Mark's obvious normal intelligence and his placement in the top track of school, he was threatened with failure that year. His teacher blamed his "irresponsibility." He did not fail, and was not recommended for summer school at the public school. He was registered for a six-weeks summer program at the study center.

Mark was at even more of a disadvantage in summer school than he had been in the homework program. He was the least academically capable of the older boys, and was continually asserting himself by making jokes, or inappropriate comments to disrupt the groups. A girl who was in a similar position to Mark was teased quite viciously by him. She had previously been a trouble-maker and a fighter in school. Everyone accepted her as she now appeared, except for Mark. He tried in many ways to make her angry, as if to see if she would revert to former behavior. She ignored him, which only made him try harder. Despite a great deal of testing by Mark, he never succeeded in getting any reaction from her. He would give up, after a while, and look about for someone else to harrass. He was the only discipline problem in the center, and nearly every day, the coordinator had to speak to him. It was like the early days in the afternoon program--when Mark had to be talked to each day and could then settle down for one afternoon.

Besides academic work in mathematics, literature, and French (which they also studied in school), the older boys also had crafts and woodworking. Mark was the most incompetent in woodworking, which he claimed was his favorite activity. While none of the children had handled tools and had to learn, Mark simply could not admit his inability and learn from others. He followed a high school boy around the room as the boy demonstrated the use of the tools. Mark would take the tool from a boy who had just been taught how to use it and tell him something completely different about its use, or demonstrate, and show that he knew nothing about it. The high school boy simply went back around again, and tried to show Mark too, in turn. Mark could not learn. He would start out with a few minutes of careful work, then restlessly begin to work faster, and end up ruining everything he attempted. The only skill he could master in the shop room was pounding in nails, and he would periodically retreat to this, pounding in nails for periods of time, and then return to start planning a project. While other boys each made several items such as shelves, simple boats and airplanes and tie-racks, Mark kept ruining one project after another. He could accept help and supervision much better from the women volunteers.

Near the end of the summer, during woodworking class, Mark announced that he had joined a local gang. He was the only child to do so. He became more of a behavior problem by the last week of summer school, and his conferences with the coordinator became more frequent. Since each group had two different classes each day, it became usual for Mark to be sent out of each group to talk to the coordinator once during the hour. He could then return and manage to get along for the rest of the period. The only class in which he never had trouble was mathematics, where there was a man teacher and a group consisting only of boys. Woodworking continued to be unsatisfactory for him, and he was the only child who never managed to finish any of the projects that took more than one period. He did make a crude shelf to place near his bed.

During the last week of the summer program, Mark deliberately ruined two projects of other children. He could give no reason for his behavior, but admitted that he would be very angry if someone ruined anything he made. (It was only after the reports were in at the end of the summer, that it was obvious to the staff that Mark was the only older boy who had not managed to make anything of real quality. It was also interesting that he waited until late in the morning, in woodworking class, to announce his joining a gang.)

On trips outside of the center, Mark would mention the nice figures of girls on the street or whistle at them. He seemed to need to show off in any new setting. While the other children were sometimes impressed by his showing off, and he seemed to have some ability at leadership, he did not seem to have any real friends. When he did not go on a trip or was not included in an activity, the other boys would mention how much more pleasant it was without him. Yet, if he were there, they seemed to look up to him somewhat, probably because of his very domineering and perhaps threatening attitude--he tried to command attention, and he was one of the physically bigger boys.

During the last week of summer school, when Mark was particularly disruptive, he approached the coordinator after the children were dismissed and confided that he was worried about the next school year. He said he hoped he would get along with the new teacher, since he did not get along with the last one. In fact, he did not get along with the last several very well. When asked how he thought he could, he had no idea. The coordinator said she thought he could figure out one obvious way. She said, "you know that teachers like children who are nice-looking, neatly dressed, and polite. You have the first two, but you have to work on the last one." Mark laughed very hard, and agreed that it was the last one that got him into trouble. Later, he would remind himself that

"I have to work on that last one." While the children were generally lacking in social amenities, Mark's lack was the most noticeable. He was considered rude and was never able to make spontaneous, pleasant comments about activities.

In the fall, Mark returned to the homework center, and attended nearly every afternoon. He brought a friend from the same class, who had not been referred to the center from the school. Money disappeared from the coordinator's purse, and the other children said that Mark and his friend had bragged at school about taking it. The other boy admitted it, but Mark denied it. They had bought sports equipment with the money, and the mothers had expressed no surprise at the sudden appearance of a number of expensive items. Approximately twelve dollars were involved. Both boys were suspended from the center, and the new boy asked not to return. Since Mark had not seemed able to relate well to the group of bright older boys, the coordinator was convinced that he so desperately wanted a friend that he allowed himself to be used by the other boy, who was known to be disliked and distrusted by the other children. Mark was told that he would be allowed to return in a month. He was visibly ashamed, and came to the center twice to talk to other boys. He carefully avoided looking at the coordinator.

Both the coordinator and the tenant relations aide felt that Mark needed more help than the center had to offer, and when informed by a mental health facility that the school had recommended him for psychiatric help, offered to cooperate. Mark and his mother had been interviewed, and the agency could not decide about accepting him. The coordinator and tenant relations aide were asked to come to the agency. A social worker who did interviews for the facility spent more than two hours with them, but kept insisting that Mark had the center, and their facility ought to be reserved for other children, who did not have this support. She complained that the school was not cooperative, and was offered weekly reports on Mark's behavior at the center. The coordinator explained that the center was not equipped to help Mark and that it was not at all certain that they could let him continue unless he got some help. In fact, if he came back at all, it would be the result of her personal intervention as the volunteer staff was very concerned about their ability to help him, and undecided about the desirability of having him around the other children. If assured of outside help for Mark, they were most willing to continue letting him attend. Late that night, the social worker called and asked a member of the project staff "now, just what is this boy's problem?" The staff member suggested that a written summary would be given to the clinic. This was done the next day. A follow-up some time later brought only the option that the mother was the one in need of help, and the agency would offer this help to her. She had already broken two additional appointments with them, and there was little possibility that she would keep one. She never did. The volunteers were unsure that they wanted Mark in the program, without some help, but when none was forthcoming, he was allowed to return. He was no longer able to assert as much leadership, since the children tended to ignore him.

Of the approximately sixty children with whom the homework center has some sustained contact in three years, only two were ever referred by the schools for psychiatric help. The first had been referred before the center opened, and a psychologist from their staff visited the center. He was impressed with the adjustment of this boy, and wanted to refer a group of children from another school. Since the center had no trouble getting enough referrals from the closer school and did not want "problem children," no attempt was made to get additional referrals.

The first boy, like Mark, was a child without a father, the oldest sibling, who was given too much freedom by his mother. The other boy and his mother were seen twice by an agency--a different one from the one to which Mark was referred--and the agency decided they wanted to work only with the mother, who refused to keep any appointments without the boy. Although never as difficult as Mark, possibly because he was younger, the staff felt that the mother was not at all interested in help for herself, or aware of any need. She would have gone, if that had been a requirement for getting help for the boy, but would not go alone. In both cases, it seemed to the staff that the boys might have been helped, but that the agency's insistence on seeing only the mothers was an excuse for not doing anything. The boys were both aware of some difficulties and would probably have kept appointments.

During the next winter in the homework center, the only troubles reported with Mark were several phone calls from parents that their boys were "afraid" of him. He was demanding money from them--usually four cents. The boys were reassured that they should not, and need not, give him money. When confronted with their accusations, Mark became very flustered and said that he only wanted to borrow money. The boys who had been threatened seemed to realize that Mark's blustering to them was quite different from his behavior when confronted by an adult. He was startled to hear that such behavior is called "extortion" and that there are laws against this. The other boys seemed reassured, and there were no further reports of trouble with Mark, who continued to come to the center four afternoons a week. Without the attendance of a number of superior boys his age, Mark's leadership qualities might have made trouble, but because of them, and the prestige of school achievement, Mark's behavior seemed a desperate attempt to be "somebody."

One day in the spring, Mark appeared at the center with a front tooth missing. It had been knocked out in a fight, and the dentist had removed the last piece. Mark announced that the dentist planned to put a gold tooth in place of the one removed. The coordinator called the mother, and asked if the staff could help with this problem. Possibly, Mark could get a porcelain tooth. The mother seemed, for the first time, more cooperative, and said she would prefer this and would appreciate any help. The staff contacted a dental school, which agreed to replace the tooth inexpensively. After Mark was taken there by a volunteer, he went twice by himself. He was given a tooth attached to a plate, and wore it only a few days. A private dentist offered to fix it more permanently, but Mark refused to go.

During the next summer, the project staff referred Mark for camp, and he attended a summar camp away from home for two weeks. It was his first trip away from home except for one week when his school class had gone camping the year before. Mark never knew that the staff had made efforts to get him to camp. It might have seemed, to the other children, a reward for poor behavior. It is doubtful, however, if the camp referral would have gone through without the reports and reassurance of the center staff. There were no reports of trouble from the camp, and Mark talked about it in glowing terms. He appeared at the study center at the beginning of the second week of the program, within a few minutes of his return from camp. His behavior was much improved over the previous summer. Very seldom during the summer did he have to be reprimanded by the coordinator, and he attached himself to a woman math teacher and usually stayed after class to ask for more individual help.

There were no male teachers involved in that summer's program, and it had been with the high school boy and woodworking class that Mark had had the most trouble. In the second summer program, one of the craft projects was making a lamp, which did not involve the use of woodworking tools, but with wiring a prepared base and decorating the base. Mark was completely successful with this project. He missed the last week of the summer program, because of a second opportunity to go to camp for another week. The staff felt that if he had been there for the last week of summer program, his behavior would not have been nearly as difficult as the former year, because he seemed so much more relaxed and happy.

His only comment about his family during that summer was to report happily one day that his mother had a "new male friend."

In the fall, Mark was transferred to a diferent school, and did not return to the center. The entire group of older boys was there, but his friends were now, according to the children, members of the gang.

In the first four months at the center, Mark's reading average had improved by seven months. A year later, his score remained the same. His achievement at school was adequate, but he was considered a behavior problem, as he had been for several years. While he seemed to want to belong to the capable group at the center, it was always obvious that he could not compete with them academically, and therefore resorted to various kinds of clowning and teasing of the other children to achieve status. This changed very much during the second summer, and he seemed no longer to need to show off. With the change in schools, however, he stopped attending the center. He perhaps knew, from talking to the children of the neighborhood, that the older group of boys continued in the center during that year with the coordinator serving as a volunteer. The boys spent all of their free time working on woodworking projects, and Mark would have been completely unable to succeed. The children occasionally mentioned him, but usually with a remark that it was so much more pleasant without him, and the fact that he had left them for a gang of which their mothers disapprove.

Children often discussed the homework center, and mentioned various reasons for liking it. Mark's reason, proclaimed very loudly during the first year, was unique, "here, everybody knows my name." He attended the center for one and one-half academic years and two summer programs. While most other children there formed lasting friendships and became very involved in peer groups, Mark's attachment to the coordinator was the main one. He was obviously forced to look elsewhere for friends.

During the next year, after Mark had withdrawn from the center, his mother called and asked for help in getting his tooth fixed. She seemed ready and able to insist that he have something done about it, and the coordinator made the arrangements.

Andrew

Andrew was brought to the study center in a public housing project in December by his mother, who said that he was flunking arithmetic and would not be promoted unless he could get help. He was ten years old, and in the fifth grade. He was at grade level by social promotion, although his work had been unsatisfactory for years.

When tested in reading, he was given a survey test that tests from middle-third grade level into high school work. This test was very difficult for him, and he averaged a grade score of 3.1, in contrast to his grade placement at school of 5.3. His mother had been told that he would be failed because of arithmetic, which was the immediate problem. His homework, work with fractions, was completely beyond him. He did not clearly understand addition and subtraction and knew none of the multiplication tables.

The help available at the center was homework help, and although the staff felt that this was not enough for Andrew, they agreed to try to help him. He attended four afternoons a week, and was given individual help in arithmetic. He managed to finish his homework every day, but never really understood the work or had the remedial help that he needed.

From the first day, it was obvious that Andrew's problems were not only academic. He was a homely boy, who was very thin and who wore thick glasses. He sulked and pouted so much that his face always had an unhappy look. When he screwed up his face in a pout or sulk, as he often did, "he and a weasel have much in common," as one member of the volunteer staff observed. While he appeared to be homely, this was not actually due to his natural featues. They could have passed unnoticed had he been a happy child. It was his continual pouty, whiney expression that accentuated his unattractiveness and made him hard to accept. In explaining the difficulty of working with him, several volunteers complained that he was the only child who "never looked anyone in the eye."

This boy had a strong impact on making the staff sympathic to the problems of classroom teachers. It was never easy to accept his continual uhappiness. Often it seemed to be Andrew's way of monopolizing individual staff members. He was the only child in the four centers whose usual expression for a long time was one of misery, and who was often identified by volunteers as that "homely, whiney kid."

By spring, Andrew had attended the center four afternoons a week, every week, and had been seen to occasionally smile. His mother visited, expressed her appreciation for the help he had received, but seemed very dissatisfied with his work and fearful that he would fail. One volunteer became so concerned after the mother's visit that she tried to push Andrew to do more work each day, and he reacted with tears. The coordinator was more successful with him, because she expected him to work only during the forty-five minutes that the other children worked and then allowed him to participate in group activities.

One day in the spring, the coordinator made up a page of arithmetic problems for Andrew, as usual, based on what he reported they were studying in school. She did this whenever he did not have homework--about half the time. He went to the room where children were doing homework, and returned after a while with his work unfinished. In fact, he had not even begun. The coordinator asked him about it. From his explanation, she realized that she had misunderstood what he was doing in school and had given him something too difficult. She said "I'm sorry, I fooled you." Then she explained the work, but made it clear that she did not expect him to do it, since it was so late, and he could join the other children in a game. He took the paper and returned to the homework room. About a half hour later, Andrew came back and put the paper in front of her. She checked it and found the answers to be all correct. She was very surprised and pleased and said so, and Andrew smiled a genuine smile. Then he said "you fooled me, so I decided to fool you too."

In April, a woman volunteer was available in the once-a-week evening tutoring program conducted at the same center. This group of volunteers were recruited from a local business office, and was predominantly Negro. The volunteer was a single woman in her forties. The group of tutors who came together from work often talked about "their" students at lunch and coffee breaks. It was obvious that they compared notes and wanted to be able to report the cute or intelligent remarks of "their children." The first reaction of disappointment of the tutor on being asked to work with Andrew was to be expected, but she genuinely tried to help him. At first, he reverted to his earlier pouting and whining. He would put his head down on his arms and seem utterly fatigued. As soon as the tutor suggested a game, he "made a miraculous recovery," she reported. For several meetings, she played checkers and other games with him, because of his reactions to any mention of academic work. When Andrew found that the volunteer did not know how to play checkers, he was very pleased. It was the only time at the center that Andrew was able to play "teacher."

Later, when the tutor began to read with Andrew, he was quite accepting of work in arithmetic and reading. He preferred the reading, although he had to read quite simple books. In fact, she felt that he "actually enjoyed the stories, but adopted a pouty expression everyso often so that no one might get the idea that he liked these baby books." Shortly after tutoring began at the center, Andrew and other children reported that he was being tutored in school. Several children were known to receive individual help during the school day, and Andrew claimed that this was the first time he had been assigned for such help.

With the end of the school year, Andrew was not promoted, as was expected. His arithmetic and reading were both very deficient. Andrew was not retested at the center, since most of the individual time with him had been spent on arithmetic.

The study center coordinator recommended to Andrew's mother that he register for the public school's summer school program. It was not known whether or not she asked the school to include him, but he did not attend.

In the fall, he twice came ~~twice~~ back to visit and reported that he was in a small class at school, and his work was "much better." The other children said that he was in a special class of fifteen children with severe academic problems. A friend from his new class came with Andrew on his visits to the center. Afterwards, when the staff agreed that he appeared much happier than he previously had, they realized that this was the first time they had seen Andrew with a friend. Most of the children at the study center made lasting friendships there, but Andrew remained very much of a loner while he attended, and seemed to be more tolerated by the other children than sought out by them for games and activities.

Andrew represents the minority group~~s~~ of children who come to the study centers without school referrals, because they need help and do not know of any other available program. Even if the group homework help was not what Andrew seemed to need, and his retardation was so severe that non-professional tutoring would not appear to be the answer, there simply was no other program available at the time he came. It seemed to the staff better to offer whatever help they could than to turn him away, and there was evidence that they helped him a great deal with his attitude toward work.

Just as Andrew was given a tutor during school hours and then included in a small class, many children have been given special help at school only after attending a volunteer program. The programs cannot all be new. But it is understandable that Andrew's impressive, though limited, change in behavior and attitude may have made it possible to include him in programs which had not seemed suitable when he was so completely defeated and unhappy.

Derrick

Derrick was one of a group of six ten-to-twelve-year-old boys who helped in setting up the study center in a storefront building. This was a friendship group who ran around the streets trying to maintain a "tough" image. When adult volunteers appeared to work in the storefront center, these boys appeared and worked with them. Derrick was one of the leaders of the group, and one of the two most difficult boys. Because the chairman was always present at work parties, she was the one who knew the boys best. Other volunteers who met them only briefly found them very unappealing, with their coarse language and disruptive manner.

The center opened in October, and the boys registered themselves as "members," but were not interested in individual help. They wanted to "run" the center, and to "help." It required very active participation of staff members to let them help, and most volunteers expressed doubt about the center's being able to include this group of boys. The other leader of the group was closer to the chairman than Derrick was, and related to her much sooner. But the boys came as a group, and had to be accepted as such.

The chairman worked every evening as a volunteer during the early weeks, and this group consumed a great deal of her time. They had developed respect for her during the "work parties" fixing up the center, and could "hang around" the center without disrupting everyone else when she was present. She worked very hard to assign them duties, and to teach them how to perform. Their tendency to be rough and their desire to "boss" everyone in the center had to be continually watched. When the chairman had to be absent, there was always the possibility that "the gang" would arrive and become very disruptive.

Two of the younger boys were assigned volunteers. Four of the boys, including Derrick and the other leader, became part of a group that worked either with the chairman or with a male social worker who was a volunteer and a member of the board. They sat at a separate table and made car models, and made up rules for the center. By February, it was possible to assign these children individually, and Derrick was assigned to a male member of the work parties.

When Derrick was assigned for invididual tutoring in February, he was eleven years old and in the sixth grade of the local public school (grade placement, 6.5). He was at grade level for his age, and had not been failed in school. A month before, Derrick had scored 4.4 as a reading average on a test given at the study center. In March, the public school put him back into fifth grade. His new teacher wrote in the referral, "Derrick has a very nice singing voice. He seldom does any homework, and his overall performance in school is very poor." His reading score at the school was 4.2.

Derrick did not mention the demotion to the volunteer, who was not aware of it until the school referral came. He did not mention it to Derrick. Two weeks later, Derrick told him about it with great embarrassment. He described Derrick as a "cool thinking, hard kind of kid, a kid of the streets, who has gotten to be a leader with his fists in a very firm sure manner."

Derrick regularly came late for his appointments at the center. Only because the volunteer who saw him regularly understood the very special situation with this group was he able to willingly wait, week after week, for Derrick to appear. In no other center in the city had children helped to clean up and build the center in the first place. They naturally felt a pride of ownership, which they showed in various ways, many times unpleasantly and to the consternation of other volunteers. It was obvious that this group of tough kids could, if not destroy the center for other children, at least make life most unpleasant for everyone else. But it would be wrong to consider this as merely a negative acceptance of the group, because the chairman of the center genuinely liked the boys and they knew it. Derrick's volunteer wanted to continue with him, even though he was usually late and absent about once a month.

Derrick and his volunteer very slowly became friends. In May, Derrick asked "where do you live?" and "what do you do when you're not here?" This was the first expressed interest in the adult whom he had been seeing for three months. Derrick found out that the volunteer lived in the neighborhood, and was invited to come to see him. When he came by, he was invited to Sunday dinner with the volunteer's two children, who spent week-ends with him. He also went on two camping and fishing trips on week-ends with the volunteer and his children. They encouraged Derrick to sing with them and found that he had a very nice singing voice. He knew only the songs that were popular on juke-boxes, and none of the folksongs that other children sing. He also did not know any Negro spirituals.

In July, Derrick scored 4.9, a gain of five months in six months. That summer, he saw the volunteer mainly outside of the center, enjoying several trips and dinners at home. The volunteer felt that by now, after five months of contact, there was a genuine closeness between them.

About this time, the center staff also reported that Derrick was no longer as difficult, and as demanding. He still "carried a chip on his shoulder" according to their observations, and could be easily ruffled. He particularly enjoyed bullying other children and using profanity in front of the middle-class volunteers to watch their reactions. But it was now possible for staff members to talk quietly with him, and to handle these incidents when the center chairman or his volunteer were not present.

When Derrick had filled out a registration card at the center, he had told the staff that he lived with his mother. After getting to know him well, the volunteer found that he and three siblings lived with an aunt. The other children lived elsewhere with the mother. It was obvious from the first week that Derrick was allowed an unusual amount of freedom and could go anywhere night or day, without having to ask permission or even tell anyone at home where he would be.

The following October, Derrick had returned to the center, but was very irregular in attendance and always late. His volunteer helped with the managing of the center that one evening a week, and preferred to continue to work with Derrick, feeling that he would eventually come back regularly. He was tested in October, but refused to do the speed part of the test that would have been his best score. On the other parts, he averaged 4.4, a loss of three months since the previous July, three months before.

In December, Derrick was picked up for strong-armed robbery. He called the volunteer and asked to see him immediately. The volunteer was asked to go to court with Derrick and his mother. Derrick claimed that he "didn't know the seriousness of what he was getting into," but also readily admitted that he had allowed himself to be put in this spot and could not really blame anyone else. He was encouraged by the volunteer to be as honest in his confrontation in court as he was with him. At the hearing, the judge began rather severely, but after hearing Derrick's story, said that he decided not to send Derrick to the detention home, but to put him on six months' probation. The probation officer was introduced, and talked with Derrick, his mother and the volunteer after the hearing. The volunteer was favorably impressed with him. Later, the probation officer told Derrick that he should attend the study center regularly, and his attendance became very regular. There were still many staff complaints about him. He still required a disproportionate amount of staff time, although his behavior was no longer so objectionable. Both he and the other leader of this group would not have survived in the center without the initial involvement of the study center chairman. Now it was possible to have Derrick attend regularly, but unless he was with his own volunteer, he immediately demanded the attention of another staff person by his behavior toward other children.

Derrick wanted to get a paper route. He, like other boys at the center, had a shoe-shine kit and went to nearby neighborhoods to shine shoes. When older, the most available job was sweeping out stores or bars at night. The staff felt that Derrick's wanting a paper route was a good sign, and encouraged him. However, his mother objected that it was too dangerous for him to be out on the streets! In actuality, he was in the street all the time, but the staff could only encourage him to try to act responsible and mature enough that she would later decide that he was ready for such a job. Sometime before, four boys had been hired one night a week to clean up the center. A different boy did this each night, and after Derrick attended regularly for some time, he was given the job once a week. He seemed to need a male staff member in the center in order to work.

Otherwise, he would still sometimes intimidate the women staff members with coarse language or simple refusal to work.

During this time, Derrick came to the center on a night when his volunteer was not there, insisted upon coming in, and began to argue about leaving. A new volunteer, a woman in her fifties, invited him to sit with her and her student. She seemed to think she was being helpful. Because of her age and her quickness to intervene, the coordinator let Derrick join her at a table, planning to discuss the incident later with the volunteer. However, within five minutes, Derrick suddenly stood up and began to shout obscenities at the woman, who seemed completely startled. The coordinator told him to leave and walked with him to the door. He left, still muttering. The only reaction of the volunteer was that she had merely asked him a "little information about himself." She was so angry that she was unwilling to acept any responsibility, and did not seem to even understand that it would have been better had she remained quiet. After a long talk with his volunteer, Derrick came back the next week to apologize. Again, the woman showed no understanding of what she had done. Despite having been told that Derrick had never been heard to apologize to anyone and the staff could only hope that he would be able to, she responded with a cryptic "well, next time, you'll know better." Derrick again lost his composure and began to berate her, but calmed down after talking with the coordinator. The woman volunteer did not remain at the center for more than a few months, and never again interferred in the coordinator's job. She ignored the children, except for her own student, and they ignored her.

The chairman who had originally befriended this group of boys and had worked with them in fixing up the center had gradually withdrawn from the center, during the second year, because of illness. Some of the children were able to talk about her illness, but Derrick was more involved with his own volunteer and never expressed the concern about her, at the center, that other members of the group did. When she died in June, the group of boys attended the funeral service. The other children, some as old as Derrick, cried openly throughout the service. Derrick sat with a wooden expression, not moving a muscle, during the service.

At the end of June, Derrick scored 6.1 on a test. Since he was in fifth grade at this time, it meant that for the first time, his score was very adequate. Ignoring the test that he did not finish the previous fall, this test showed a gain of twelve months in eleven months since the previous July.

During the summer, Derrick reverted to his lateness and missing of appointments. The volunteer usually saw him outside of center hours, and took him on several trips. Derrick also went on two group trips with the study center children and staff and his volunteer.

The study center coordinator reported that Derrick was now no longer a behavior problem. He had developed a very "protective" attitude toward her and the center. Since he had always claimed to live with his mother, the staff often mentioned how much closer he seemed to feel toward an aunt. On holidays, when the children made gifts, he usually made them for his aunt. On Mother's Day, he made a jewelry box as the other children did, but put "Mother" on the top.

Other children freely put on the name of the person with whom they actually lived. Derrick was the only one who put "Mother" on his, and confided that it was really for his aunt. Most of the staff never knew that Derrick did not live with his mother. None of the records ever showed it, and from Derrick's attitude in persistently keeping it a secret, he obviously preferred for them not to know. The card never was changed. It is the only card at the center which shows a completely false picture of the home situation. Derrick lists his mother and father and then wrote that he lives with his mother. He listed seven children, and said that was all there were, although later it turned out that there were also married ones. Other children listed the families according to where they lived, and often wrote down "aunt" or "grandmother" without hesitation. Many children lied about their grade level, but Derrick was the only one who consistently mentioned living with his mother, when the subject came up in the study center.

In the fall, Derrick continued to see his volunteer, but usually outside of the center. He came in for testing in December, but after doing better than before on the first parts of the test, was unwilling to try on the third part, in which his score went down three years. The average was 5.6, three months less than the previous test. Without the third part of the test, his score was nearly the same as the previous one.

The volunteer continued to see Derrick about once a week, through his sixth grade year, the following summer and the next year when he began seventh grade in a different school. Derrick calls him when he needs him, usually for specific reasons. This last fall, it was for help in seventh grade mathematics, which was given regularly for several weeks, until Derrick felt he no longer needed it. He is on the basketball team of his school, and academic work is not important to him, apparently, except to keep from falling too far behind.

It is now three years since Derrick first began to see this volunteer. For the last two years, most contacts have been outside of the center, and the majority of them no longer involve academic help. Derrick comes mostly to talk. Most of what he gained from this relationship is called "social education" by his volunteer. The term seems appropriate and is the obvious change in Derrick. He visits the center periodically, and is polite and respectful. It is no longer necessary for him to be the center of everyone's attention. When he now visits the center, only the people who know him are aware of his visit. Since it is no longer an imposition to have him come, the volunteers who know him are genuinely pleased to see him, and he knows it.

During the first year, Derrick did make some measurable academic gains in reading. His volunteer knew that it was important for him to reach the 6.0 reading average by seventh grade, so that he could qualify for a regular high school program. When Derrick had to fail for the first time, it seemed important for someone to know about it. Derrick's probation officer was apparently a very fine person, whom he seemed to respect, but the man did not live in the neighborhood. Nor did he have five months previously, which was the length of time it had taken for the volunteer to feel at all close to Derrick. It is the volunteer whom Derrick has always called about any happy event or any problem.

It is interesting that both leaders of this tough group of boys turned to athletics for success. Both made limited academic gains, but after a year, seemed to prefer to see a volunteer outside of the center setting. The other boy claims when asked about Derrick, that "we're still up tight." Actually, the boys see very little of each other because they go to different schools and are very involved with athletics. Both now spend their free time with boys who are also successful in athletics, and this keeps them from the street where they formerly spent most of their time.

Derrick could not have been registered in a regular tutoring project, nor was he ever recommended for any of the special school remedial classes. He had to come on his own terms. While the benefits that he gained are similar to what a boy might get in a typical Big Brother program, the storefront center seems a better locus. Big Brothers, without a program, can be very inquisitive about the children assigned to them. Derrick maintained his privacy very well, and was not at all interested in other people for months. The center was a "neutral" place. He had a pride in ownership, although he did not for a while care to participate in the tutoring offered. After the group was accepted and "hung around" together, he was finally anxious to have a volunteer of his own, like the other kids. Since his problems were mostly in his relationships to other people, they could best be worked out in such a setting. That they could be was only due to the skill and devotion of the center chairman, his volunteer, and the study center coordinators. It was never easy, because other volunteers and staff people often felt, and said, that Derrick and his friends took too much of everyone's time. Had Derrick been seen entirely by himself, outside of the study center, his worst difficulties would not have been apparent. He could be a well-mannered boy. But as soon as he was with other children, he quickly became the center of some disturbance. Adults whom he did not know were also good for "baiting."

Derrick's teachers have been pleased that he has a volunteer showing interest in him, and were also supportive of the study center. Although aware of his academic problems, they never recommended him for any remedial class. It would have been pointless, because he would not have lasted. He demanded an adult's involvement so continually that he was one of the most-discussed children in the center and one of the most resented by the volunteer staff. Only because they could gradually see slow progress in his social behavior were they able to accept the assurance of those directly involved with him that it was worth continuing to try.

Most of the boys in Derrick's age group leave the center when their volunteers leave. The children who come when they are younger have a much better chance, because there is a longer period before the pre-adolescent time when they leave. Derrick had only one year of regular tutoring, but he had the chance to get such help, whenever he needed it, after that time. Mainly, he had a stable relationship with one adult over a period of years, that will continue through high school. The fact that the volunteer lives near him is important for this boy, who can impulsively call or come by and not have to wait for formal appointments. Perhaps the most impressive part of Derrick's behavior is that, like the other children, he shows real judgment in the use of this privilege.

Derrick has had no further trouble with the police, and is no longer so vulnerable since he has discovered an interest in athletics. For those who remember this blustering, rude, coarse, and extremely tough boy it is hard to believe that he can function as a member of a team, but he does. Because of the limited goals for him at the center, which were realistic, he is headed for a regular high school program, instead of the remedial one he would probably otherwise have been in.

CHAPTER VII

VOLUNTEERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Direct observation and the quantitative reading score data demonstrate the different levels of effectiveness of the various after school study centers. When these measures are linked to the cost per pupil, Welles-Darrow must be judged as the most effective in terms of academic criteria, STEP the least. South Shore and North Park fall in the middle category in approximately that order.

How can these differences be most adequately explained? Clearly there are alternative types of explanations. At one level, and perhaps the simplest, is the quality and stability of the coordinator. STEP was run by a student who had limited skills and organizational talents. The project also resisted technical assistance. By contrast Welles-Darrow had an effective coordinator and direct professional support from the principal investigator in developing and maintaining the program. South Shore, likewise, had a highly professional and competent coordinator sensitive to the issues of utilizing volunteers. North Park suffered in its early years from a lack of competence and stable coordinator. The role of the coordinator was less central because the core of original founders were so actively involved that they were able to supply initially the essential and required stability.

It is possible to extend the analysis. The quality of the coordinator must contribute to a different type of program and operation and in turn to a different organizational climate. No doubt the quality of the volunteers and the nature of the students are part of the organizational climate, but the underlying assumption of this part of the analysis is that all of these factors interact to produce an organizational climate. The differences in the effectiveness of the various after school study centers, therefore, can be thought of as differences in organizational climate or organizational milieu. It is the purpose of this chapter to present some systematic and quantitative data which help to present a better understanding of these differences. From a practical point of view it is clear that there will be a variety of elements which can help to reproduce these organizational climates under different circumstances. In particular, we are concerned with identifying the impact of the coordinators and volunteers on the organizational climate.

To explore the different organizational climate of the various study centers, a number of dimensions were considered. These included the perspectives of the tutors, namely the attitudes which they held and which guided their work; their actual involvement in the programs, as revealed by their reasons for tutoring and the level of their satisfaction; the effectiveness of supervision and the patterns of communication in various study centers, and; the group characteristics of the tutors.

At this point it is well to recall that the programs of the four centers were hardly similar, although each involved a mixture of concern with academic skill and social skills. STEP set up a program of individual tutoring of children which sought to offer tutoring services on five afternoons a week. A youngster was to be offered two afternoons of tutoring a week, for a period of from one to one and one half hours each day, plus group activities after the tutoring. Occasional Saturday programs consisting mainly of trips to parks were also part of the program. The coordinator of this project defined the effort as one in which, in addition to receiving educational aid, the children also found an individual "friend" in their respective tutors.

At North Park, the program consisted of one-to-one tutoring of children four evenings a week. The goal was to have each child tutored one evening a week for two hours. Children could come on other evenings for homework help, but few of the children being tutored came for this extra help. In addition, volunteer tutors were encouraged to take their individual students to museums, special shows, and similar places of interest on weekends. Members of the Board of Directors of this center, who had developed considerable sophistication in describing their efforts, spoke of seeking to help the youngsters both in education and in social growth. One of the coordinators defined the goal of this study center to be a place where "kids not only learn about their school work, but also learn to trust people more."

At the South Shore program, the students were given individual tutoring for one hour each week during the late afternoon. Later, reading clubs and some interest group activities were added for a small number of children, but the primary emphasis of the program was on one-to-one individual tutoring. The coordinator defined the goals very heavily in educational and academic terms, although she was aware of the problem of social and personal involvement. She was hopeful that she could show "the school system that here is a method that works."

Fourth, and finally, the Welles-Darrow program consisted of homework help on a group basis during four afternoons a week, and children attended as often as they liked. In addition, a limited group of children were tutored individually by a group of volunteers on one night a week for one and one half hours. During the summer months, classes were held with specific group activities, such as mathematics, literature, science, crafts, sewing and creative writing, in order to retain and strengthen the academic interests of the children until they returned to school the following autumn. The coordinator of this center stressed academic help but as in the case of South Shore, she recognized that the academic program supplied a basis for social learning as well.

In summary, STEP was actually oriented to socialization and interpersonal issues to the greatest extent; North Park represented a more balanced interest in academic and social goals, while the South Shore and Welles-Darrow study center were more heavily oriented toward academic goals.

The analysis of organizational climate proceeded by an examination of the perspectives and attitudes of the tutors. By means of mailed questionnaires and repeated follow-ups, systematic data on the tutors' background and outlook was collected. Tutors were asked to complete a schedule for each of the youngsters with whom they worked. These schedules included a wide variety of items on the tutor's estimate of student performance and on their knowledge and contacts with the students. (Table 7.1 presents the response rate to these questionnaires.)

The response rate does not appear to be high. In three cases it was approximately 50 per cent and in one case it was as low as 35 per cent. However, in part this was an artefact of the data collection procedure and the definition of who constituted a tutor. In each center, there were stable and transient tutors, but the contacts covered the total number of tutors at each center for a full year period. Many of the transients had either moved away or lost contact, so that if the coverage were limited to the stable tutors, those who actually did the work, the response rate would have appeared much higher.

Perspectives of the Tutors

The first dimension to be reported is the perspective of the tutors. In particular, this included their definition of the goals of their study center and their definition of the capacities of the youngsters. What did the tutors believe were the operational goals of their study center? Was there a great difference from study center to study center?

Despite the variations of the history of the four study centers and the original goals that were held by those who organized

TABLE 7.1

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES BY TUTORS OF 1965-66

		Total (Per cent) Questionnaire Response	
	No. of Tutors 1965-66	No Response and not Reached	Total Response two Mailings
STEP	100.00 (81)	54.3 (44)	45.7 (37)
NORTH PARK	100.00 (75)	41.3 (31)	58.7 (44)
WELLES-DARROW	100.00 (49)	65.3 (32)	34.7 (17)
SOUTH SHORE	100.00 (93)	52.7 (49)	47.3 (44)

them, differences in goals as actually seen by the tutors were not great (Table 7.2). About one quarter of the tutors in all of the study centers reported that the goal was only to improve social skills (and race relations) and made no reference to the academic content. There was some greater attachment to purely academic goals in the Welles-Darrow Study Center and in South Shore, as contrasted with STEP and North Park, reflecting actual differences in program orientation. About thirty per cent of the tutors at Welles-Darrow and South Shore reported that they saw the study center goal as one of improving academic skills, while this figure for STEP and North Park was approximately 13 per cent. In turn, at STEP and North Park the emphasis on the combined goals of academic skills and social skills, including race relations, was correspondingly higher.

To probe the tutors' estimate of the problems and potentials of these youngsters, the tutors were asked to describe the source of the children's difficulties. The material generated by the questionnaires was not very revealing although it was possible to classify the responses into categories such as family problems, personality difficulties and school difficulties. These responses did not throw much light on the differences between the various centers, however.

Instead, the tutors' estimate of the intelligence of their youngsters was much more revealing (Table 7.3). The attitudes which the the tutors held about the goals of the study centers seem to reveal a set of common understandings which have spread through the volunteer after school study center movement. By contrast the tutors' estimate of the intelligence of their students is a sensitive indicator of their

TABLE 7.2

GOALS OF STUDY CENTERS AS SEEN BY TUTORS

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.00 (37)	100.00 (44)	100.00 (17)	100.00 (44)
Don't know and no response	5.4 (2)	6.8 (3)	5.9 (1)	6.8 (3)
Improve academic skills	13.5 (9)	13.6 (6)	29.4 (5)	29.6 (13)
Improve social skills, race relations, etc.	24.3 (9)	29.6 (13)	29.4 (5)	25.00 (11)
Combination of improving academic skills, social skills, race relations, etc.	56.8 (26)	50.0 (22)	35.3 (6)	38.6 (17)

commitment to their task. The capacity of the slum school teacher to perform effectively is limited by his limited confidence in the students' ability to learn. He sees him as having limited "intelligence." The tension of the slum school is based on the constant underrating of the youngsters' ability to learn, which is in turn based in part on the students' lack of preparation, compounded by the limited resources available for his education. This is reinforced by the hostility or prejudice--overt or covert--of teachers against minority group youngsters and lower class youngsters.

Thus, it is of central importance to note that in Table 7.3, for all the study centers, there was a favorable estimate of the intelligence of their youngsters. Overall, only approximately 15 per cent of the tutors characterized these youngsters as being of below average intelligence. Clearly such a judgment was markedly at variance with their classroom performance. These attitudes are reflections of more optimistic and more benevolent attitudes than those found in the public school system.

No doubt the tutors were saying that, if these youngsters were given a different type of education in the public school system, they would be able to perform at a much higher level. Of course, there is a danger if the tutors overestimate the capacity of their pupils and thereby set unattainable goals for them. This does not generally seem to have been the case. In particular, when comparisons are made from study center to study center, there is a strong sense of realism in the evaluations of the tutors. To

TABLE 7.3

INTELLIGENCE OF CHILDREN AS VIEWED BY TUTORS

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.0 (45)	100.0 (56)	100.0 (42)	100.0 (50)
No Response	2.2 (1)	1.8 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Above Average	28.9 (13)	32.2 (18)	52.4 (22)	16.0 (8)
Average	53.3 (24)	44.6 (25)	35.7 (15)	66.0 (33)
Below Average	15.6 (7)	21.4 (12)	11.9 (5)	16.0 (8)
Other	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	2.0 (1)

be freed from excessively negative stereotypes did not necessarily imply wild optimism. Thus, the tutors at Welles-Darrow have the highest estimates of the intelligence of their pupils, reflecting the greater selectivity of recruitment and the actual fact that a majority of the children came from the "top track" of the local school. Perhaps the greatest degree of realism was to be found in the estimates of the South Shore group of tutors, of whom only 16 percent thought that their youngsters were above average. The judgment of STEP volunteers appears quite unrealistic, since the least academically retarded child there was at least a year behind, and there was no evidence in the records that a single child was of "superior" ability. Yet more than 28 per cent of the volunteers judged their individual students to be "above average."

Volunteer tutoring rests on a balance between realistic estimates of the potentials of youngsters and a sense of enthusiasm, plus a feeling of some personal reward for the tutor himself. Professional commitment requires a reward system of financial incentive plus a similar sense of accomplishment. Clearly, the problems of the inner city school teachers rest in the sense of frustration, or at least lack of personal rewards, that develops for many teachers. The organizational climate of the after school study center is reflected in the responses to the question "who benefits from tutoring?" The findings in Table 7.4 reveal a very high degree of personal reward and satisfaction for the volunteers.

More than half of the tutors reported that both tutor and child benefited. This attitude was clearly at the core of the

TABLE 7.4

TUTORS' VIEWS ON WHO BENEFITS BY TUTORING

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.0 (45)	100.0 (56)	100.0 (42)	100.0 (50)
No Response	6.7 (3)	3.5 (2)	11.9 (5)	4.0 (2)
Child alone benefited	2.2 (1)	1.8 (1)	16.7 (7)	26.0 (13)
Both tutor and child benefited	77.8 (35)	89.3 (50)	57.1 (24)	64.0 (32)
Tutor alone benefited	11.1 (5)	5.4 (3)	14.3 (6)	2.0 (1)
Other	2.2 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	2.0 (1)
Don't know	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	2.0 (1)

volunteer system. This is not to overlook the variance between study centers. STEP, which was most closely linked to the civil rights movement, had only 2.2 per cent who said that the child alone benefited. In contrast, the South Shore project manned by older women with stable family lives and a sense of service gave a different response; 26 per cent said that the child alone benefited. The organizational climate of a study center is made of different elements, and while the sense of personal satisfaction is a crucial element, traditional commitments to service continue to be highly relevant.

The second dimension in seeking to understand the organizational climate of the various study centers was to compare and contrast the involvement--both actual and subjective feelings--of the tutors in their study centers. The perspectives of the tutors toward tutoring have helped to explain the effectiveness of the centers in general. These measures of involvement are useful in throwing light on the differences between the programs. They help identify organizational elements which the coordinator is able to develop or at least maintain.

In probing involvement, it is interesting to compare the reasons given by the tutors for their involvement in after school study programs. While the civil rights movement and interest in civil rights was an important early element in the development of these efforts, it appears that an exclusive interest in civil rights is not an effective basis of involvement. Even at STEP, which was the most closely linked to the civil rights movement, only five per cent reported that the reason that they were interested was "civil

TABLE 7.5

REASONS GIVEN BY TUTORS FOR TUTORING

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.0 (37)	100.0 (44)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (44)
No Response	0.0 (0)	6.8 (3)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Civil rights interests only	5.4 (2)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	6.8 (3)
Enjoyment in working with children only	23.4 (9)	34.1 (15)	47.1 (8)	43.2 (19)
Religious or ethical convictions only	2.7 (1)	2.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	2.3 (1)
Civil rights interests and other factors	59.5 (22)	40.9 (18)	47.1 (8)	34.1 (15)
Other factors with the exclusion of civil rights interest	8.1 (3)	15.9 (7)	5.8 (1)	13.6 (6)

rights interests only." (See Table No. 7.5). Such an orientation would lead to other, more direct, types of civil rights activities. Of course, a mixture of civil rights interests and concern with children appears to be rather widespread. However, a significant concentration of tutors reported that they were active because of their "enjoyment in working with children only." Even at STEP, almost one quarter of the tutors gave that answer as their reason for involvement. At Welles-Darrow and South Shore, the figure reached almost half. It is necessary to point out that the higher the concentration of persons with such an involvement, the more effective the program.

The obverse of the reasons for involvement is the tutors' reported feelings of satisfaction with their accomplishments. There was considerable variation in the reported level of satisfactory involvement and satisfaction was roughly linked to the level of program effectiveness (Table 7.6). Thus, the Welles-Darrow project had the highest reported concentration of satisfactory experiences among the tutors (75 per cent approximately), while STEP had the lowest (50 per cent approximately). STEP had a much higher level of reported sense of "frustration" experiences (over 20 per cent). These data further clarify the organizational milieu of the different after school study centers.

At this point, the turnover rate among tutors is a relevant and objective measure of involvement. Obviously, there were many factors accounting for turnover, but to some extent the turnover rate can be considered to be a measure of tutor satisfaction; it was assumed that more satisfaction would lead to less turnover. It was also

TABLE 7.6

TUTORS' EVALUATION OF THEIR TUTORING EXPERIENCE

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.0 (37)	100.0 (44)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (44)
No Response	0.0 (0)	2.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	2.3 (1)
Satisfactory	51.4 (19)	70.4 (31)	76.5 (13)	66.0 (29)
A Chore	8.1 (3)	18.2 (8)	5.9 (1)	11.3 (5)
Frustrating	21.6 (8)	9.1 (4)	11.8 (2)	11.3 (5)
Combination of all three	18.9 (7)	00.0 (0)	5.8 (1)	9.1 (4)

assumed that turnover is an element in program effectiveness; the higher the turnover rate, the less the program effectiveness. One measure of the actual turnover was the percentage of tutors who were active in the year 1965-1966 who were still tutoring as of February, 1967. STEP had the least stability; only 19.0 per cent of the tutors from the year 1965-1966 were still tutoring as of February, 1967. North Park had the highest degree of stability and the lowest turnover, although its turnover was still considerable. It had 38.7 per cent continuity by this measure. South Shore was closer to North Park than to STEP with a figure of 31.8 per cent. The measure was not applicable to Welles-Darrow, since it recruited a considerable portion of its staff for its particular summer programs. Thus while it does appear that for on-going programs, low turnover is a relevant element in academic effectiveness, it is possible with adequate supervision to organize and administer a new group of tutors for a particular short term program.

The third dimension required more direct measures of organizational climate, such as the impact of the supervision and the degree of interaction and communication between tutors and their pupils. When such direct measures of organizational climate were explored, a more positive linkage with academic effectiveness emerged.

Adequate supervision is essential for the solidarity and the effectiveness of a volunteer effort. It is well to remember that STEP, being a student organization, operated under the leadership of an individual leader who had a strong personal impact on the organizational climate. North Park was organized on the basis of an informal leadership group while South Shore and Welles-Darrow had the most organized division of labor and professionalized leadership.

In Table 7.7, the tutors' evaluation of the quality of supervision they received is reported. The expressed level of satisfaction was much greater at Welles-Darrow and South Shore than at North Park and especially at STEP. The difference between Welles-Darrow and South Shore is limited; at both centers more than fifty per cent thought it was adequate. At North Park, the percentage who thought the supervision was good dropped to 27 per cent, while the concentration of those who spoke of adequate supervision was over 60 per cent, thereby indicating a somewhat lower level of satisfaction with supervision. At STEP there was a markedly lower level of satisfaction; less than 20 per cent said the supervision was good and the same percentage stated that it was inadequate. In short, there was a real link between academic effectiveness and the impact of supervision.

It was assumed that another approach to describing the internal structure or organizational climate of the study centers is to ascertain the extent to which the study center coordinators got to know individual youngsters in their program. It turned out to be that this measure was unrelated to the effectiveness of the study centers and indicates that some degree of formal, rather than personal, organization was compatible with an effective program.

All tutors at the four study centers were asked to fill out a questionnaire on each child they tutored. Similarly, all of the coordinators were asked to fill out the same questionnaire. This

TABLE 7.7

TUTORS EVALUATE THE QUALITY OF SUPERVISION THEY RECEIVED

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.0 (37)	100.0 (44)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (44)
No Response	0.0 (0)	2.3 (1)	0.0 (0)	9.2 (4)
Good	18.9 (7)	27.3 (12)	52.9 (9)	56.8 (25)
Adequate	62.2 (23)	63.6 (28)	35.3 (6)	29.5 (13)
Inadequate	18.9 (7)	6.8 (3)	11.8 (2)	4.5 (2)

supplied a measure of their intimacy and knowledge about the youngsters who were in attendance. At North Park, the coordinator could comment on 83 per cent of the youngsters, reflecting a high degree of social solidarity at the center and high interaction between the coordinator and the students. At STEP the percentage was 57 and was an expression of the personal interest of the coordinator, but at the Welles-Darrow project and South Shore the percentages were somewhat lower, being 39 per cent and 35 per cent respectively.

The question of the tutor and the coordinator contacts with the child's family was of considerable interest. In planning innovations for urban education, a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the necessity of contact with families. The amount of contact between family and study center staffs varied from program to program, but these findings indicate that in the strategic importance of contacts with families, after-school study centers in the inner city can do a great deal even under conditions in which their contact with families is limited (Table 7.8). Coordinators had the bulk of family contact and even for them it was typical to have a limited or an occasional contact. The amount of contact by tutors was much less. STEP, which had a considerable amount of contact by the coordinator and tutors with the families, was not necessarily the most productive. (As indicated in Chapter IX, most of these contacts were telephone calls resulting from absences of children.)

A similar picture is presented from the tutors' and coordinators' estimates of perent attitudes toward the study center. In all four centers, both the tutors and the coordinators only very

TABLE 7.8

CONTACTS WITH CHILD'S FAMILY BY COORDINATORS

	STEP	NORTH PARK	WELLES DARROW	SOUTH SHORE
Total	100.0 (41)	100.0 (55)	100.0 (31)	100.0 (49)
No Response	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)
Many	24.4 (10)	27.2 (15)	12.9 (4)	6.1 (3)
Occasional[1]	68.3 (28)	65.4 (36)	71.0 (22)	91.8 (45)
None	4.9 (2)	7.4 (4)	16.1 (5)	2.1 (1)
Don't Know	2.4 (1)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)	0.0 (0)

[1] Usually denoted telephone calls at [illegible] or parents of the child stopping in at the center.

rarely believed that the parents' attitudes were hostile. The most frequent response among tutors, approximately 50 per cent at STEP, North Park and South Shore, was that they were supportive. Only at Welles-Darrow was this viewpoint less frequent (16 per cent). Parental indifference rather than hostility was the basic issue. The attitudes of the coordinators were very similar in their reluctance to report open hostility.

Finally, the fourth dimension is the social group characteristics of the tutors. Tutoring, aside from practical considerations, involves social interaction, and it was to be supposed that the social characteristics of the tutors would come into play in this respect. Of course, within any group there are persons whose personality and individual motivation allows them to transcend their social characteristics, but for most individuals, social characteristics and social background influence their capacity to relate to the kinds of youngsters involved in these programs. Of course, it was also the case that individuals with a wide variety of social backgrounds were involved, but at each center, there was a pattern of recruitment which tended to produce a concentration of one or two social types.

There is every reason to believe that indigenous talents can and are being developed for involvement in tutoring programs. By indigenous people is meant local residents from the same social background of the pupils. In this sense, in each of the four study centers, the tutors were predominately "outsiders." Even when they lived close by, they were recruited from a more advantageous social position. Patterns of residence and age varied considerably and help to identify the social types. STEP was made up of college students who lived on the University of Chicago campus and therefore were geographically close residents, but basically outsiders. The tutors at the STEP program were the youngest with a median age of nineteen years. On the other hand, the tutors at Welles-Darrow were the most geographically dispersed. About 35 per cent came from the suburbs; another 35 per cent came from other parts of the city of Chicago, mainly Hyde Park and Kenwood, but it is of note that even this study center, located in an inner city housing project, was able to recruit about 30 per cent of its tutors from a few block radius. These came from a redevelopment project to the east of the public housing project. The median age was approximately 26 years. The social type was essentially younger housewives with college education. The dominant social type at South Shore was markedly different. This project, located in a transitional community, was able to recruit local residents (86 per cent came from a few blocks of the study center); they were mainly older housewives, 44.5 was the median age for the tutors, and they had less higher education than those of the Welles-Darrow group.

The North Park program was heavily locally recruited. Drawing on the socially heterogenous near North Side, approximately 65 per cent came from within a few blocks. The tutors were as young as those at Welles-Darrow, with a median age of 26 years and with a comparable level of education. They were young adults, often divorced or single, rather than married women recruited from the Hyde Park and suburban areas.

The tutors were overwhelmingly a white group and mainly women. The STEP program had a sizable concentration of males--30 per cent. The concentration of males at North Park was equally high reflecting the young adult culture of that area of Chicago. The percentage of males at South Shore was 11, and for Welles-Darrow, 6. These males were college students or students in training to be teachers, plus a few retired men.

These social characteristics are linked to turnover. Clearly the high turnover of college students weakened the effectiveness of STEP, an experience which has been duplicated in other projects included in the Mayor's Committee on New Residents directory. This observation calls into question the role of the college student in the volunteer educational movement. This is not to underemphasize their potentials or to overlook what they themselves learn from such experience, but it helps to present a more balanced picture of the component parts of volunteer education, which seems likely in the years ahead to be staffed by resources from high school students, housewives and retired adults. These data underline the variety of social types that can be drawn into volunteer work, and highlight the conclusion that the relative advantage for one group versus another in part depends on how they fit into an ongoing program, as much as their special social characteristics.

In summary, the organizational climate is an appropriate concept for understanding the relative effectiveness of various after school study centers. The notion does not deny the relevance of the characteristics of the pupils or tutors, but rather focuses on aspects of the program that are subject to influence by the coordinator. The concept of organizational climate highlights the differences between the classroom and the after school study center. The general impressions about the goals of the study center which tutors hold are still more important than their positive evaluation of the youngsters' potential and the volunteers' feelings of satisfaction with tutoring. Adequate supervision appears to be a key factor, at least from these specific data and from other observations throughout the project. While involvement with the family may be a strategic goal, there is much that tutors have been able to accomplish even without extensive efforts in this direction. When the statistical data are joined with the case materials, what appears crucial is the ability of the tutor to serve both academic and personal needs in the immediate setting.

CHAPTER VIII

ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS: INTERNAL MANAGEMENT

Record Keeping

The problem of keeping even minimal records in a volunteer operation such as a tutoring project or after-school center turned out to be a major one. The basic conflict seemed to be that non-professionals find record keeping difficult to do and some professionals reacted to the necessary paperwork as if it were beneath their dignity. They preferred to be actively involved in work with the staff or children. Seldom did they realize the necessity to train non-professionals to keep minimum records.

Attendance records were best kept in a record book, with separate books for volunteers and children. These records were later transferred to large sheets of graph paper, for comparison. In many centers throughout the city, the local agency wanted a "head count" each day of boys and girls attending. Frequently the staff therefore had the children sign in, but this was not followed in any of the demonstration centers. This procedure was also a deliberate attempt to know who was there, since, if a volunteer was not immediately found, a child might leave without anyone knowing that he had arrived. At the demonstration centers, however, it was more important because, at first, the children often arrived on the wrong evening or afternoon. A list of who was assigned each evening was crucial and had to be changed periodically. Volunteers or children sometimes changed evenings and would forget to inform the coordinator. The simple mechanics of keeping track of who was to see whom and when was not too difficult when the number of children was fifty to seventy-five a week in a center. This seemed to be a reasonable number for one adult to handle and this was necessary, since the coordinator was the only person who was there every evening.

The college student project had all of its information on one card, and attendance was marked on each card. This turned out to be more time-consuming than a separate record book would have been. The same cards were used by the volunteers for writing simple reports, since it was believed that one card with all information on it would simplify the job. Actually, it made the coordinator's job much more difficult, and there was never a clear picture of how many children and volunteers were missing on an occasion.

Many families did not have a calendar. The possession of a calendar indicated a family that was more sophisticated than the majority. Finding how rare calendars were in these homes, one of the first, most meaningful projects for the children was to make such a calendar to take home and put on the wall. A card with the child's appointments written very clearly, name of the volunteer and a telephone number for the study center became accepted as a minimum kind of record-keeping for the children. Had we known in the beginning just how difficult it was for these children and their families to keep track of the days, we would have tried a special project of calendars once a month to help the children until they became attached enough to the center to be able to remember.

The minimum records would appear to include attendance books, which tell the story of several absences in a row very clearly. It was impressive at the storefront how patient some of the men volunteers were with several older boys. But it was important that someone be aware of the absences and find out how the volunteers felt about it.

Sometimes, instead of an attendance book, the center had a large chart on the wall of each day of the week and who was expected. This also gave an immediate picture of the attendance facts, but was done successfully only in middle-class neighborhoods where there was an "office" which was used primarily by the staff. In the storefront center, where records could be marked up by the children or lost, it was important that attendance books could be locked in a drawer and removed from the center over holidays. In such a center, it turned out to be important for the records to be easily moved, since there was always the possibility, and twice the actuality, that someone would break in and rummage through.

But records made by the staff are not sufficient, because in any lower-class neighborhood there is such a need for the children to lie about their ability that it is necessary to check with the schools, mainly about their actual grade placement. The college student project had most of their children referred by the schools directly, and therefore received accurate information on grade placement and age. With later self-referrals there was a lack of awareness that this was a problem. Afterwards, volunteers and staff people were quite unhappy to find that the child was not in the grade he claimed, but actually two grades below.

In the housing project center, the children were selected from the families in the local neighborhood organization, who tended to be local leaders. These children were able to put down the proper information, even if they had flunked. The next group were over-achievers, and they were also able to give us accurate information. In one case, a girl put down "7th grade" and the staff, after observing her, suspected that she was in an EMH (Educable Mentally Handicapped-retarded) room, which turned out to be true. This was never mentioned to her and with volunteers who were sensitive and aware, the problem would not be serious. (She was not a school referral, but came with her mother, when the mother worked as a volunteer.)

At the storefront study center, where the children registered themselves, they very often lied about grade placement. Usually, they put down the proper grade for their age. This could make a great difference in judging how retarded they were academically. Here it became crucial to have some information from the schools. For example, a child who claimed to be in eighth grade and read at third grade level could hardly be helped. Actually, the child was in fifth grade and there was a possibility of working with him. Next to grade placement, age was the area of concern to the children, but hardly ever did they make themselves younger. It was almost always a matter of adding two or three years to their age. This was common in pre-delinquent boys who hung around with older children.

Membership cards were prized by the children, and they often asked that they be replaced when lost. The staff considered buttons, which the children would have enjoyed, but these were never tried. The staff generally thought that a card, which the child was free to "hide" in his pocket if he preferred, was better. Actually, the pride of membership was great among the children, and the problem with buttons would have been that the center would become too widely known and too many children would come. It would still be interesting to try this method with children, to whom belonging to the center was obviously such a matter of pride.

Coming to a center never did seem to present a problem of a stigma. In fact, the opposite was usually true. One school which was especially supportive of a storefront center, quickly reported that it had become a "Badge of Honor" to have a tutor, so much so that the children who did not attend seemed to feel left out. This school, which shared a center with several others, also reported that the children always talked about the center as "ours--well, it's for our school." Despite their knowledge that children came from other schools, their attitude was one of definite ownership.

After attendance records and membership cards, it is important to have some method of getting information from the schools. Some centers successfully gave printed forms to the schools for the parents to use in registering their children. Our original referral and follow-up form seemed much more successful, but after the publication of Helping Hands and the beginning of various poverty programs in the public schools, those schools which had previously cooperated in completing such forms sent word, by letter or phone, that they no longer had time for this, due to the enormous amount of paperwork involved in other record-keeping. It became necessary to contact the teachers directly, which was actually much more fruitful because the children almost always mentioned their attending the study center.

In the school primarily served by North Park, individual teachers were very aware of the value of the center to their children. It was not difficult for a volunteer to get in touch with them by letter or postcard. The children reported back to school primarily about outings with the volunteers, and the teachers were pleased for their students to have these experiences. They were always helpful with suggestions of what could be done to help, even though they felt discouraged about the individual child's chances for success. By contrast, the adjustment teacher who was assigned the liaison job by the school saw the children only as problem family children who were obviously not getting anywhere and could not be expected to.

School referrals of any kind remained a problem. The best system was perhaps to offer mimeographed forms to the school, and encourage the parents to make the arrangements directly with the center. However, it is essential to have some testing system to confirm the school's statement about the child needing help. The public schools test so infrequently that their records, especially in inner city schools, are quite inadequate. Often they contain errors as well. Although most after school study centers recruited through the public schools, it is doubtful that they received the group which they solicited, or had any way of knowing, without tests, which categories of children they were serving. All volunteer programs were listed as serving "underachievers" in the city directory, and most defined their group as being "one to two years retarded in reading." As explained in the section on testing, a minority of the children tested in other centers not included in the demonstration project fitted the actual category defined by sponsoring agencies.

Records on individual children were usually kept in separate folders, alphabetized by the children's last names. Parental permission for the child to participate in the program, school referral information, and test results whenever available were the minimum information. The records at South Shore and STEP included notes written by the volunteers after each meeting. No forms were used for this, and the notes usually included information on the instructional materials used. At North Park and at the housing project homework center, more information was assembled on the children's behavior in both the individual tutoring and contacts with others. If volunteers did not have time to write their information after the evening lesson, they were encouraged to take home a form and return it the following week. Various forms were tried. Those who wished to write an account of the evening without a form were encouraged to do so, but many needed a specific form, at least in the beginning. Suggestions about writing down the materials used sometimes brought very general responses--"a library book" or "an arithmetic book" and it was necessary to ask on the form for specific information about books and materials. No attempt was made in either South Shore or at STEP to use the information in the records, except for work with a specific child. At North Park and at Welles-Darrow, this material was used as the basis of staff discussion and written material for the use of the staff. The demonstration that the material was of value to the project staff made it easier to ask for more detailed information from the volunteers. When volunteers did not find time to write any records, the coordinators of the three centers (North Park, Welles-Darrow and South Shore) assumed responsibility for contacting them about once a month, often by suggesting that the child being tutored be dismissed a few minutes early, to get a verbal report on what was going on. The volunteers never objected and some were much more willing to talk about their work than to write about it. The coordinator had the child's folder with her, and recorded notes during the interview.

Some nominal records of the contacts between children and volunteers were kept in many centers, but unless the information was of obvious use to the staff, the volunteers began to question their being asked to write reports. After consulting the project staff, several centers not cooperating with the project excerpted from the records examples of volunteer's comments and work, and mimeographed these for distribution to the staff. They reported that this minimum use of the records was enough to demonstrate to the volunteers that their comments were of interest and they felt encouraged to continue.

At South Shore, volunteers were asked to fill out a form about their impressions of the success or failure of the tutoring experience. At North Park and Welles-Darrow, the coordinators were much more acquainted with individual children than were the two supervisors at South Shore, so that they were asked for evaluations and also contributed to the anecdotal records on the children and periodically gave written evaluations of the volunteers to the principal investigator.

At North Park, the children's reactions were gathered primarily from the anecdotal reports of the volunteers. Children were asked to bring in their report cards, if they did not do so voluntarily. They knew about the records kept by the staff, and they sometimes asked to write their own evaluation of what went on. Their own comments about their own work were almost always complimentary. When older children assisted younger ones, they would often ask if they could write on a tutor report form. They were far more critical of the children and more concerned about "good behavior" than were the adult volunteers.

The coordinator, who keeps the records, is also the person who must be available to volunteers and to children. All four centers with which the project cooperated closely kept minimum records on what volunteers did with the children, and these were most important for substitutes who sometimes had to take over in the absence of a regular volunteer. Even if they ignored what was in the record, and did something completely different, they seemed to feel reassured by having some information on what the regular volunteer was doing.

For training and supervising volunteers, more detailed records were invaluable. Interestingly enough, despite the number of teachers and former teachers involved in the projects, none of them kept detailed records. They ordinarily felt quite sure of their job and tended to write in "lesson plan" form. Young, inexperienced volunteers who had not taught were the ones who were most eager for help, and they were therefore more willing to write detailed reports. Many volunteers who wrote only minimum reports would prepare summaries for presentation to the staff, or when requested to do so by the staff.

The scope of the records kept by a study center or tutoring project should be determined by the use that will be made of them. Many projects found it discouraging or impossible to keep records because the volunteer staff did not know that any use was being made, or would be made, of the records requested. As a minimum, it is necessary that someone read the reports and comment on them. Obvious as this appears, it is a standard complaint from volunteers who have to make reports which they think are ignored. In one project the volunteers became so convinced that no one read the reports that they began to insert sentences such as "John jumped out of the window and killed himself." Finding that this brought no response, they announced that they would no longer write reports, unless they were read.

Supervision

The qualifications of a study center coordinator, like those of a good teacher, come somewhere between the training of education and social work. School principals are aware that among the best teachers are often older women who have previous experience in social work. As one principal said "they can at least picture the homes from which the children come." It is a common complaint among principals that teachers do not have background in general sociology and social work courses to understand the families with whom they work.

While both have some relevance for the job, background in teaching did appear to be quite essential. Strong motivation and intensive training such as offered in the VISTA program can produce effective personnel. In meeting with groups of VISTA candidates in training, the principal investigator was impressed with the interest and understanding of what is usually called community organization. The project observed one of these young people in a study center who performed very well. This part of his training in community organization seemed most relevant and seemed to set him apart from other coordinators. In his case, the lack of any background in teaching was irrelevant. At least this part of the job could be learned by an intelligent adult as part of on the job training. The fact that this coordinator was a young man was also important. There was, of course, a selective process in who was picked to be a VISTA worker. More young adults with VISTA or Peace Corp background need to become involved in these kinds of programs. For both boys and girls his presence added another dimension that differentiated the study center experience from school.

The demonstration project never hired a male coordinator for any of the centers, although they did have men on their staff. Their attempts to hire the few candidates they found were to no avail. The success of the young man with VISTA was not only because of the need for the boys to have a man in their lives. The response of girls to him was also very good, and the impression that learning is a manly activity is important to both. In observing the group, it was obvious that even the shyest girl at the center was very aware of his presence.

It is difficult to find men who can respond adequately to girls in a study center setting. Since children grow up so much faster than they did years ago, there is a great deal of what appears to be flirtatious and seductive behavior and this takes a degree of maturity that centers did not find in most men volunteers. It was not difficult to assign male volunteers to work with individual girls, but the ability to relate to groups of girls requires more maturity and understanding on the part of men than on the part of women, because of the girls' needs and inabilities in relating to them.

These problems became more obvious when the male volunteers worked with groups in homework. College students, high school students and older men were able to work effectively, however. In only one case was a young man completely unable to function with a group, and it was the girls who made it impossible. After initially accepting him very well, the girls found that they could make him react with anger to remarks about his clothing. Egged on by several others, one girl asked "why do you wear such sissy shirts?" Because he reacted with anger, they continually looked for new ways to get reactions. Another day, a girl kept dropping her handkerchief and note paper to see what he would do. He demanded that she pick them up, and confusion resulted as she refused. Even after he was assigned to a group of boys, the girls continued to have some contact and it was impossible for the coordinator to forsee the various ways that they would find to bother him. Having found that he reacted so strongly, the girls could hardly be blamed for continuing, and despite genuine efforts on the part of the young man, he was never able to relate well to the girls. Despite this extreme example, it is only fair to make it clear that this was an exception, important because it showed how girls who were able to relate respectfully with other male volunteers could become so rude and difficult when a young man allowed himself to over-react to their testing.

Another important attribute of a coordinator is flexibility. The personal and community contacts of the coordinators involved in the demonstration centers seemed crucial in recruiting volunteers, and in helping the programs gain local community support. But the VISTA volunteer was also obviously at an advantage in not having any vested interest in any local agency, school, or church. He took the job with the assumption that he would build local support and have the initial opportunity to approach any group in the community without having been involved in former tensions and problems between agencies. Many projects suffered from the possessiveness of local factions. One demonstration project effort to develop a study center in a church was dropped because of the hostility of a local agency which considered the area its territory.

Unfortunately the parent agency which hired the VISTA worker expected him to mobilize support in six months, which was, of course, unreasonable. After three months on the job it was suggested that he develop tutoring programs. Six months later he was expected to be able to turn these programs over to local people—an idea which turned out not to be workable. His work was taken over by a part-time person in his agency, which was an unsatisfactory arrangement. Either he had to stay for a longer time or be replaced by another VISTA worker, which was not done.

A sense of humor is always listed as one of the assets of a good teacher or anyone who tries to work with children. This certainly is crucial for a study center coordinator. The job is a taxing one and volunteers must have someone who appreciates their feelings. For example, one coordinator periodically put out information sheets on the basis of test results and observations which she labelled "how we are doing." This seemed to be just the right touch of lightness to be appreciated without being offensive.

To deal with children, it is important that someone be available who can remain outside of the immediate crises. Volunteers sometimes get very excited or very angry with children and a calm adult on the premises can be most helpful. The coordinator must set limits for the children and enforce them because she is there all the time and knows the children better than the volunteers who come only for a limited time,

One important criterion for selecting a successful coordinator is whether that person has in the past or is currently tutoring children. This would appear obvious, but it is not. The ability to work with groups of children can be learned on the job, but unless the coordinator herself is or has been involved in individual work with children, it is harder for her to understand the work of others. The volunteers also realize the difference, and are very aware of the coordinator who is not "on the firing line" with them. Coordinators usually did not work regularly with a child, because of the demands of their job, but often took children for a short time until a decision could be made about assigning them. They sometimes substituted for volunteers who were absent or sat with children waiting for volunteers, working with them until the volunteers came.

The South Shore coordinator spent one summer tutoring in another project, when her own center was closed. She wanted to see for herself the results of the standard policy in many other centers of working with two children at one time, instead of individual tutoring. At the end of the summer, she was convinced that, without careful screening, such work was much less effective than individual work. She was convinced that, because of the needs of the children, each of the two received less than half of her attention, and the presence of even two children was distracting to both. Observations of other volunteers at the same center also reaffirmed her conviction that individual tutoring is best.

In Chicago, two central agencies were involved in recruiting volunteers. The Volunteer Service Corps of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago and the Chicago Human Relations' Commission both referred prospective volunteers to projects. A minority of volunteers in the centers with which the project cooperated came from these sources. From the experiences of the first storefront center in a middle-class community and the South Shore YMCA, it was obvious that recruitment of the best volunteers depended very much on the coordinator's or volunteers' personal contacts with the community. Mass recruitment through businesses or through newspaper publicity were never as satisfactory. Three years of experience in other centers confirmed these first impressions.

The coordinator of the center is the one who is in contact every day with the children and the volunteers. The successful ones were very tutor-oriented, and considered making themselves available to supervise volunteers as the most important part of their job.

At Welles-Darrow there was a small office room, but this was not used by the coordinator. She was involved with the program every day, even though volunteers were working with the children. Seeing that they were busy, making herself available wherever needed, but always working with the children herself, made her more of a co-worker with the volunteers than a supervisor. She had no assigned responsibility for either groups or individuals.

At North Park, the coordinator's desk was in the same large room with the volunteers and children. This was a great advantage in a project with approximately fifteen children and adults each evening. Although she could not hear what was going on at each table, she could tell a great deal of how the lessons went by observation, and even how the children and volunteers felt about them. She was there before the volunteers arrived and after they left.

At South Shore, one of the two coordinators was often in an office down the hall from the tutoring room. But the other was usually in the main room, checking to see which children did not show up and offering to telephone the homes. Volunteers were greeted when they arrived, and when they left. The paperwork was done before and after the time set aside for the actual tutoring, although with two adults, it was possible to also do some of this work after lessons had begun.

One of the problems with STEP, the college student project, was undoubtedly the use of an office removed from the tutoring lessons and physically behind the room used for the lessons. There were obvious inhibitions to walking with a child being tutored through a roomful of children and adults to see if the coordinator was free. Neither were volunteers apt to return to the office, after the children left, because it was late in the afternoon and the majority of the volunteers were leaving.

The effective coordinator has to be able to know what is going on between children and volunteers. She has to be more available than just located in an office near the actual tutoring, and has to judge how much help or support volunteers need. If available every day, by being physically in the room when lessons begin, she finds that some volunteers want to show her or tell her what they are doing. Many children want to be greeted and show her their work. Other children and volunteers may be made nervous by the close presence of another adult.

The successful coordinators were very visible. They knew of new materials that were available, and they knew of ideas that volunteers had tried successfully. Often, they had examples of what some children or some volunteers were doing, to help other volunteers who were not as skilled.

The personal involvement of the coordinators in the work of volunteers affected the patterns of recruitment. Their friends and the social and community groups to which they had access were important in making the initial contacts with prospective volunteers. This pattern never changed, and volunteers were most successfully recruited by the groups already active in the centers. Their friends and the contacts of their friends brought the most stable volunteers. Most successful volunteers were recruited by word of mouth, and more by individual contact, despite the many groups interested in the work who asked for study center staff to meet with their groups.

When newspaper advertisements were used for recruitment of volunteers, less competent and short-time volunteers came. Many were inquiries, which seemed very spur-of-the moment, and when invited to attend the center to learn about it, many of these people did not show up. Some volunteers were successfully recruited by business companies, but the percentage of stable ones was small because some volunteers seemed to agree to work only because it was expected of them. With all large recruiting efforts, there was tremendous loss between the first signing up of prospects, and those who actually showed up at the centers. And a minority were never satisfactory volunteers although they came regularly for six months, because they were quick to say that they had only agreed to do it because a supervisor had asked them to.

Groups of high school and college students were sometimes recruited, and seemed to need someone from within the school to work with them. They needed supervision on the job, but they also seemed to need the involvement of someone from their school. Otherwise, they developed a feeling that as long as a certain number of students came each week, it need not be the same ones.

The coordinators of South Shore, Welles-Darrow and North Park all felt that high school students were in many ways superior to college students as volunteers. Their reasons for thinking so were different. Some felt that the high school students had a commitment to their own community, which college students living in the community temporarily could not share. Others felt that high school students were more willing to accept supervision and more willing to ask for help from adults because they were not so alienated from adult society. They still physically lived at home, and were less involved in their own search for independence. Another reason given for the superiority of high school youngsters was that they did not seem so concerned about the children's restlessness and complaints about learning. It had not been so long, perhaps, since they felt the same way. They were much more tolerant, generally, of the children's need for mobility and even for nonsense. A child could squirm or ridicule his work, and the high school student was usually not so worried about his loss of control or the lack of concern for achievement. School had not become such a deadly serious ordeal that they could not accept the childrens' wish to stop the work after a reasonable time and play checkers, even if there was obviously much more work to be done.

Because the coordinator was the person always available at the centers, she also became involved in orientation for volunteers. It was possible to have a group orientation only at the beginning of a new semester. Volunteers came alone or in pairs at other times.

Each center had some materials about their own programs, in addition to the pamphlet on "After-School Study Centers." Volunteers visited at least once at Welles-Darrow and at South Shore, to observe a tutoring lesson or group homework help. At North Park, this pattern was changed to two visits whenever possible, since the neighborhood was quite difficult and the staff wanted to be sure that the volunteers realized the commitment they were making.

It was not possible to recruit volunteers in advance. The centers all found that when people came to volunteer, they had to be immediately included into an ongoing program. Realistically, there was no waiting list of volunteers, as there was of children. Volunteers would never have come, the centers were convinced, if told that they were needed "next month." The exception was for the special summer school at Welles-Darrow where the commitment involved group work with children for a definite period one morning a week for six weeks. These people were recruited beginning in March, and began work in June.

The presence of a coordinator who is available during tutoring lessons was of immediate benefit to the volunteers. The coordinators were impressed, when they did miss a day at the center, at how much the children reacted to their absence. Children who seemed mainly aware of their own volunteer would react strongly to the fact that a coordinator was going to be absent. They immediately wanted to know who would be in her place. It is obviously not only the staff who like to know "who is in charge."

Most supervision of volunteer work has to come during the actual tutoring, or at least during the afternoon or evening that the volunteer works at the center. A variety of patterns were tried in various centers to augment this direct supervision.

At South Shore, the coordinator was a social worker. Four experienced teachers offered to do the basic supervision. They were not involved in the day-to-day work of the center, and were seldom there. Volunteers had to sign up and go to their homes; very few went and those who did felt that the supervision was far too rigid. Some were told to use only one workbook for a forty-five minute lesson. They all used a variety of materials, but felt uncomfortable about not following the supervisor's wishes. After the social worker who was at the center every day assumed supervision, there were many fewer problems and volunteers were quick to ask questions. Whoever supervises a study center has to learn along with the staff, and be willing to be very flexible.

The college student at North Park had no professional background in social work or in education, but had the closest relationship to her volunteers. She had had some previous experience in work in summer camps, including tutoring. While she was very close to her volunteers, she was also successful because she had continuous supervision from the project staff, in particular from the principal investigator. She was at first reluctant to answer inquiries from volunteers, but she was very reliable about collecting their questions and passing them on to the project staff. The principal investigator read the volunteer reports and the questions that the volunteers had accumulated. She fully responded in writing to their queries and added some of her own. Monthly staff conferences were held at which the principal investigator and the study center coordinator were present, by dismissing the children a half hour early and asking the volunteers to remain a half hour longer. These meetings tended to be somewhat formal. Volunteers were asked to present summaries about children with whom they were working, or there was a topic for general discussion such as the testing program. Because North Park, as well as all the other centers, cooperating with the project, followed the policy that there were no supervisors who were not part of the working staff, communication developed. In time the study center coordinator took a more and more active role in answering queries and giving direction to the work of the volunteers, and the principal investigator was able to withdraw from this role.

Another crucial task of the coordinators was to collect new teaching materials and make suggestions to the volunteers in this respect. It was also the responsibility of the coordinator to explain test results to the volunteers. Specific answers were found not as difficult for coordinators as offering general support. The coordinators must be supportive and sympathetic, particularly with young volunteers. The coordinators all felt that young people needed more support and encouragement than did middle-aged housewives or volunteers with teaching or related professional experience.

One obvious hazard of young adults working with children was their tendency to expect superior intelligence or achievement. At STEP, 28 per cent of the volunteers considered their students to have "better than average intelligence," although it appeared that none did.

At North Park, the volunteers were much more realistic, but perhaps because many had been working in the center for a long time. There has been so much written about "hidden talent" that young adult volunteers, particularly, often have unrealistic expectations. The attitude was similar to that of a college student counseling in a volunteer program who came for advice and asked "how do you know when you have two C and D students sitting in front of you which one has the hidden talent?"

Part of this over-estimation came from the tutor's desire in the first lessons to see strengths of the children. The fact that the children were usually extremely amenable at first, perhaps because of their own hopes, made it difficult for the volunteers to realize that this was not the whole picture. As they got to know the children better, the job of tutoring became more difficult. Feelings of personal defeat and discouragement almost always became obvious with the young volunteers.

The centers that relied primarily on adult housewives felt that the first month was most crucial. Support during that month until the volunteer felt secure and committed to the center was most important. After the initial month, most older volunteers were almost certain to continue. Those who left did so during the first month, so much so that coordinators said that the first month was the crucial one, and "if the volunteer comes regularly for a month, you know you can then count on her and she'll stay. The main drop out is in the first month, and there is no use calling these people because you do not want them. If we can only keep them for one month, they are 'hooked.'"

With young adults and students, the first month was also crucial in the same way. By having the volunteer visit twice at the storefront and sit in on tutoring lessons, they not only realized what the job involved, but also developed some relationship to the other tutors. This was considered important, because their hardest time seemed to come after six or eight weeks, and they were reluctant to admit their discouragement. Having an experienced volunteer feel some responsibility for a new recruit made it more likely that the new volunteer would find support in the second or third month when she got discouraged.

At North Park the coordinator knew from the records the feelings of some volunteers, but found that many were reluctant to admit just how discouraged they felt. The informal sessions with volunteers provided the group support the volunteers needed. They needed time together without the professional project staff. The coordinator learned that, if she asked the volunteers how their work was, they often felt compelled to report that everything was satisfactory. But if given the opportunity and encouragement to talk, they would admit the feelings that they did not write in their reports. It was a pattern for the volunteers working together to go out at least once a month, after the tutoring sessions, in addition to the formal staff meetings. There was always one volunteer in the group who expressed concern and dissatisfaction. There was also always at least one who had gone through the same experience previously. These informal meetings were considered by the coordinator and the volunteers to be most helpful. After two years as a coordinator, one college student felt that the most important understanding she had gained from the job was how long and slow the process of helping these children was, and that her main contribution was to help volunteers to understand this.

Some volunteers would only admit feelings of dissatisfaction after being assured that such feelings were quite normal. They often then blamed their reluctance on their initial enthusiasm. They reported that, despite orientation, they wanted so badly to succeed as volunteers that they had entertained unrealistic hopes for themselves. These had not usually been expressed, and the staff had no way of knowing that the job they did had not measured up to their own private hopes and expectations. This, the volunteers felt, was hard to admit.

The personal relationship between child and tutor cannot be separated from the academic work. Many volunteers reported concern with the strong attachment the children showed for them. "This kid expects too much of me." "I worry, because Mary says she will never work with any other tutor--is she too attached to me?" Only one volunteer expressed the opposite fear, that she was too involved in a study center child and was worried that her own children would become aware of this. At some time during the tutoring lessons, many volunteers became concerned that the "child is learning only to please me."

Young volunteers are able to admit that they seldom accept the coordinator's initial orientation about how difficult the job is. They are enthusiastic, and most anxious to do well. The children are usually, at first, also trying very hard to please a new adult. If adults have unrealistic expectations, it can almost be assumed that the children do too. Perhaps the process of working together is as much influenced by the child's, as by the adults', realizations that progress is slow.

The children rather quickly became attached to their volunteers, and some did claim that they "could never work with anyone else." Some went so far as to say they wanted a new volunteer who "looked like this one" or "who smiles like she does." This never seemed to be true. When volunteers did leave, the children rather quickly related to a new adult. They often referred to former volunteers, but the one who was helping them at any one time commanded their loyalty. It was so important to have someone that these expressions seemed more a fear of being left while still needing help than of wanting any particular physical features in a volunteer. "Being accepted" was important to these children, and the fact that they could be accepted by more than one adult, and work successfully with them, was also important.

Coordinators had special tasks in recruiting and supervising men volunteers. One of the failures of elementary education in general and in our efforts as well has been to involve men. At the storefront, about one third of the adult volunteers each year were men. These were predominately white professional young adults. In the housing project, the only men aside from one staff member were a man teacher and high school boy in one summer school and several high school and college boys during each academic year. At South Shore, the staff was also overwhelmingly female, but there were always some men volunteers and one of the coordinators was male. The college project had about one-third male volunteers. Despite various recruiting efforts of the individual projects and the city coordinating agency, the bulk of volunteers has always been and still is, female.

The college student project did not function successfully enough for the staff to know if there was a difference in the capability of male and female volunteers there. At the other three centers, the coordinators and staff agreed that men were more difficult to supervise in work with children. Work with children is obviously more often a skill possessed by women. The men were often either too hard on the children, too demanding in their standards, or they tended to be overly-impressed with the children's abilities. They had much less awareness of what can reasonably be expected of children at any given age.

The men volunteers, far more often than the women, were discouraged about the lack of achievement of the children and would attempt to be tough and demanding, so that the children withdrew. Ironically, they were also more often passive and insisted on letting the children plan their lessons, or just play games. They more often marked the children's papers with "100's" regardless of the content and despite general center policy to not give grades. They would report "she reads well" or "he is good in arithmetic," despite the record which showed very poor achievement or without apparently realizing that the work the child did well was on a level that was below where he could actually achieve.

The male volunteers accepted the notion that "boys need a role model." This idea has so permeated the popular culture that non-professionals and parents in the inner-city mention it as often as do professionals. It is always in terms of working with pre-adolescent boys that efforts are made to recruit men.

No one could dispute the problems of boys growing up without adequate male models for identification, but the discussion never includes the needs of girls for male models, and this is a problem of at least as much importance. At the study centers, it was the girls who seemed most aware of the men. It was the girls who more often mentioned a male staff member or visitor, who may have left the center a year before.

The need for boys to relate to men is so well accepted that the young men in the center had no trouble in accepting the curiosity of the boys about them, or their hesitant attempts to approach them. But they often reported feeling at a loss to know how to handle similar approaches from the girls. The girls would more often approach them without knowing what to say, or make polite or disparaging remarks about the young mens' clothes. Often, they would just "hang around" watching them.

At North Park, and Welles-Darrow, the volunteers who worked together quickly developed a strong feeling of comraderie. It was customary to introduce every new child or volunteer to everyone. The fact that male volunteers knew the names of the girls, and could greet them by name, seemed important. Because of staff discussions about the apparent wish of the girls to relate to them, they were better able to accept their overtures and make casual conversations with them. A number of men volunteers worked with young girls under twelve, because they were next on the waiting list when the men volunteers were available. But the men volunteers--more than the women--were obviously important to the other girls who attended the same evening.

If a boy approached men as the girls do, to try to make conversation, his need would be understood by everyone and accepted as very normal. If a girl expressed the same need, she might be considered sexually precocious or even disturbed. The fact that sensitive, thoughtful volunteers needed help in understanding and accepting the girls' needs indicated a basically different attitude towards girls. The fact that never did the parents or non-professionals mention such a need for girls--but talked very often of the accepted necessity of contact with males for the boys--seems to demonstrate a lack of awareness of the problems of girls.

For some time, there has been concern that girls can be more vicious and more self-destructive than boys. Study center staffs were aware that the girls were often scratched, kicked, or had their clothing torn by other girls. The boys did not so often scratch, kick or tear clothing, and the results of their fights were not so obvious.

In meeting with volunteer groups, and observing them in action, it seemed obvious that the men volunteers were often concerned and at a loss to understand the "inappropriate" remarks made to them by girls. Particularly young men adults sometimes either abruptly ended such attempts at conversation, over-reacted with anger, or resorted to "kidding" themselves. If volunteer groups plan to include girls in their programs, some discussion of the need and lack of ability of girls to "talk to men" ought to be understood. Their tentative, halting efforts ought not to be rejected or made fun of.

The need for more male contact in the schools is obvious and often discussed, but usually only in terms of recruiting more male teachers. From our experience, it was not only the amount of contact that was important, but the quality of such contact. Certainly more efforts could be made to introduce more part-time paid and volunteer help into the schools. It could even be argued that it would be beneficial for all children to have increased contacts, even brief ones, with men who are not teachers and preachers, who now represent the major adult male contacts of many inner-city children.

One special problem of supervision which emerged at the storefront center was with nicknames. This example represents the need for the coordinator to deal with problems that may be specific to a given center. Because so many chindren registered themselves at the storefront center, this presented them with an opportunity to display their nicknames. Their own given names were distinctly different from those of the "over-achievers" of the housing project center. They even differed from the given names found in the group referred by the schools to the college student project. The difference was in the abundance of unusual names. These included very fancy, made up names and most unusual surnames used as given names. Even names of the months during which the children were born were used in one family. Along with the unusual names was the practice of giving nicknames to the children, nicknames which completely replaced the given name within the family circle. Sometimes these were similar to "Treasure" and "Queenie." Other times, they had derogatory overtones and carried hidden negative meanings.

The staff became aware of the problem of nicknames at the storefront center during the first few weeks. Volunteers were generally called by their first names, and their use of the children's nicknames was sometimes defended by reference to the orientation material which encouraged them to find out what a child preferred to be called. These instructions had been meant for such innocuous changes as "Bob" or "Bobby" for "Robert." Even after many discussions of these names, and some children's apparent feelings that there was something wrong with their odd names, the volunteer staff insisted on the practice of using nicknames. Even after a child confided that his nickname had been selected by the family because it rhymed with "stupid," many volunteers found it hard to believe that these nicknames were derogatory.

One evening there was a particularly disruptive outburst in the study center which brought the whole problem of nicknames to a climax. For the first time, the children in the center joined in the disturbances started by youngsters without appointment who came in to disrupt. The study center children started to use nicknames for each member of the volunteer staff. These were nicknames which the staff had not heard before, but which the youngsters were obviously using among themselves to refer to staff members. All of the nicknames in varying degree were either just nonsense or derogatory. The adults felt that they were derogatory when, for example, one was called a "big oak." The volunteers learned that for these youngsters, nicknames had derogatory and depreciatory overtones and were not merely terms of intimacy. After that evening nicknames were dropped. It is our conclusion that in the search for self esteem, teachers and volunteers need to use the given name, to convey that the name, even if strange or odd, is acceptable.

At this point, it is relevant to join together the findings on the turnover of tutors and the turnover of students at the four study centers. Turnover is an indicator of the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of the internal management of a study center. However, it is necessary not to treat the findings in a mechanical fashion. As reported previously, the STEP project had the highest turnover; this represented both the impact of internal management and the fact that college projects have built in high turnover. North Park had the lowest turnover in good measure reflecting the character of the particular pool of volunteers which it mobilized, nearby residents with a strong commitment to social change. The South Shore turnover was only slightly higher than that of North Park, and given the fact that it was a racially changing neighborhood, this was, to a considerable extent, an expression of the effectiveness of supervision. Welles-Darrow recruited a large proportion of its volunteers for short term summer projects, so that the data on turnover are not as meaningful.

One of the issues in turnover is the relative turnover of volunteers and of students. These data are interesting in and of themselves, but they are also a reflection of the effectiveness of study centers and the problems they have to meet. If it were the case that student turnover was higher than the turnover of tutors, this would be a clear indication of the ineffectiveness of a specific program. It would imply that the tutors were unable to hold and service their youngsters. In general, this was not the case.

For this purpose it is possible to examine turnover in percentage terms of the tutors and students who started fall in 1965 and who were continuing as of February, 1967. STEP displayed high turnover of both tutors and youngsters; it is interesting to note that the rate of turnover for both was equal; 19.0 per cent for the tutors and 19.4 per cent for the students. By this measure, South Shore had a lower rate of turnover and again equal for both tutors and youngsters; 31.8 per cent for the tutors and 30.4 for the students. At North Park, not only was the rate of turnover lower but turnover was lower among the youngsters than for the tutors indicating the capacity of the center to hold its youngsters; the figures were 38.7 per cent for the tutors and 56.7 per cent for the students.

Program

In launching the demonstration, it was assumed that the essential educational content would have three elements; home work help, one to one tutoring in reading and mathematics, and a library facility. Home work help was seen as supplying an appropriate setting where youngsters under the supervision of adults could get assistance and support to do their homework. A minimum of training and skill would be required. The tutoring program was obviously more complicated, but it was seen as a relatively straightforward program which could be readily administered. The techniques and direction of tutoring is set forth in the principal investigator's pamphlet on "After School Study Centers" and in Helping Hands (University of Chicago Press). The idea of the library was to make it possible for youngsters to take home books, since practically all of them never had any books in their homes. At the time when the demonstration project was launched, it was in effect the informal policy of most Chicago schools not to allow youngsters to take their textbooks home at night, claiming that they generally lost them if they did.

The quantitative data presented above indicates that the academic content had an impact. But the study center also had other activities, including games and cultural activities, which were part of the program and which probably contributed to the effectiveness of their work. It is necessary, at this point, to examine with some care the notion of cultural enrichment, since it has come to be a slogan with mechanical and arbitrary implications.

In recent years, one approach to helping poor children has been to emphasize "cultural enrichment." Foundation grants and school programs have been based on the concept that, if exposed to "cultural activities," slum children will be motivated to achieve. Like other approaches that have attracted national attention, this seemed a possible basis for action programs that might solve the problem by exposing poor children to many new experiences that are part of the heritage of the so-called middle class child. There is some evidence that children respond to such activities with new interest in learning, and signs of mental and emotional growth. The result is an almost mandatory requirement to include these programs in any project that seeks funds for work with inner-city children.

Manuals called "Cultural Enrichment" have appeared. These are lists of suggested group trips in the city. Whether children are taken to an expensive concert or to a free trip through a factory or industry, the result is called "cultural enrichment." The term, unfortunately, has become so well-known that one mother brought her child to a study center saying "Please take him. I want him to have a little culture."

In fact, the groups of volunteers who started out trying to do group work and individual work immediately found that group work was far more difficult. Many found it impossible, since it requires more preparation and some ability to supervise a group of children. Despite the obvious difficulties these children had in working in groups or in sharing adults, many guidelines and suggestions for volunteer efforts included an almost mandatory requirement that such groups concern themselves with "cultural enrichment."

Webster's dictionary defines "cultural" as "fostering of growth." There is no mention of its being an extraneous characteristic of any group, or that it must be acquired through the payment of money or by traveling to new places in large groups. Middle-class parents foster their children's growth in many ways, including the use of public facilities. This use of public facilities is a small part of the efforts of parents, who would be deeply concerned if their children came to regard "culture" as something that exists only in specific institutions. Despite this, such programs are sometimes expected to provide for the "cultural" needs of poor children.

There is a danger that the popular concept of "cultural enrichment "can actually detract from more meaningful contributions that study centers can make. The experience of working with individual volunteers in a familiar setting was obviously a very meaningful experience for many children. One obvious lack of the children is in knowing what to do with their free time. Both at the housing project and at the storefront center, children learned many games which middle-class children play. They began, for the first time, to visit each other's home to play games. At both centers, games and puzzles were checked out and used at home over the weekends.

Inner-city children have not had adequate experiences of traveling to places of interest in the city. It is equally true that they have other needs which are as valid. Games were one major one, and this included a wide range of alternatives. The girls had not learned to play "jacks," although quick to claim that they could. Neither did they know that they were available in the dimestores for ten cents. None of the children could play any table game "by the rules," including checkers. Active outdoor games were just as much enjoyed, and just as new. The songs which children sing in day-camps and overnight camps seemed completely new to the children. Usually, they like to sing, but their singing was quite limited to "pop" tunes from the radio.

Sewing classes were most popular. The children too young to participate would stand outside the door and look with longing eyes at the older girls who were included in this class. They did not stand outside of other classes, but each day, there were young children watching longingly outside the sewing room. This was obviously a skill with special meaning to them.

Volunteers have numerous skills and much knowledge to offer children in the inner-city and ought not to be under pressure to do group work before they are able to or wish to. The individual trips that volunteers made with children were most successful. Of those trips, the volunteers consistently reported that the most successful ones, when they felt closest to the children, were the times the children came to their apartments to bake, prepare lunch, or to help in building bookshelves.

It would seem reasonable that group work within a familiar setting ought to precede taking groups a distance from the center. Many volunteers graduated from individual to group work, or were able to function as effective group leaders because they had special skills to teach. But in general, most volunteer projects found working with a group of underachieving children to be most difficult. It is unfortunate that the whole concept of "cultural enrichment" came to be so divorced from the work of the study centers, so that tutoring projects often felt compelled to offer group trips, whether or not they had a viable group, or any experience with groups.

At the storefront center, all children went on individual trips with volunteers, or two volunteers who were friends took their children together. Despite the obvious success of this pattern, there were continual discussions of the value of "cultural enrichment" and whether the center ought to do more. Group activities planned after tutoring lessons on specific evenings went well, and the volunteer

Children do not always get out of an outing what might be expected. One group of boys from a slum neighborhood, taken on a short tour of various communities in the city, were most impressed and talked most about the fact that there were clean alleys. They had not realized that such alleys existed. A group taken to a music concert in a very beautiful auditorium appeared unimpressed with the music compared to the beauty of the building which overwhelmed them.

Among trips from one center which the children enjoyed was a trip of primarily very capable, motivated children to a college campus. In their literature course, they had read of Enrico Fermi and were surprised that important work had been done in Chicago. They especially talked of wanting to see the plaque, commemorating the first chain reaction. Actually, this did not interest them as much as the fact that a college is not confined to one building, as their experience of schools had led them to believe. Even more exciting to the girls was the visit to a staff member's house for lunch. After the trip, the boys talked of the college. The girls talked of the house, which as one girl excitedly reported had "carpet in the toilet--just like the White House," which she had, of course, never seen but only imagined. There were also several outings to see movies in the homes of volunteers. The homes fascinated the children much more than did the movies.

After conducting a six week special summer school in the housing project area for three summers, the staff realized how much it meant to the children to travel out of the area in small groups. To give a youngster a meaningful experience outside his neighborhood, it is not necessary to organize a large scale cultural event. Informal outings were offered at every opportunity. But there was also a feeling among the staff that the nicest program for these children would be, ideally, that they could be welcomed to another area. For years, people have come to inner-city areas to work with children. It would be especially meaningful for these children to know that they are welcome elsewhere, and that it is not all a one-way process. If middle-class or suburban groups would offer their facilities and invite these children to share their church centers--and especially their children--for half days or two days a week, the children would not only be delighted, but would learn about different social worlds and become more capable of bridging what is now a real gap between their world and others.

Many centers in Chicago started out as very ambitious projects, taking for their model the first after-school center which opened in a middle-class neighborhood. It was not difficult for this group to recruit seventy volunteers including a large number of women who had previously taught school, and to secure during the first two months, donated books and reference materials worth approximately $2,000. They served five schools, and children from first grade through the eighth grade. North Park, in particular, started by fashioning itself after this format. Despite the fact that their available space was much smaller, they recruited children with flyers, and sought to help several neighborhood schools. They even included pre-schoolers and high school students in their original plan, but found that these groups did not come in any significant numbers.

Volunteers who were recruited were offered a wide variety of jobs to do, including reading to groups of pre-schoolers and leading clubs for high school students. When the center actually opened, it was obvious that there was no available room for group activities. The majority of children were in third through sixth grades, and they needed individual help. The program was redefined as a one-to-one tutoring program, although the board felt that this was only the first step. This objective turned out to be enough work for them, and, except for a few children who always came to do homework, the program remained essentially one of tutoring.

Other programs, such as South Shore, began as tutoring programs and then found that their "graduates" needed additional help. They added some reading clubs to help these children, but only for one year were these a significant part of the program. The next year, there was practically no response from the children to the invitation to join a club.

Wherever projects opened their doors to all children who wished to come, they found themselves overwhelmed. One in the inner-city ended up taking only one-sixth of the children who wished to attend.

Most projects call themselves "tutoring" programs, but very few actually have operated on a one-to-one ratio with adults and children. Particularly in the inner-city most projects seldom succeed in having more than one adult to work with three or four children. Tutoring on a group basis is much more difficult and requires much more training and experience. In general, the results are less satisfactory. There are exceptions in almost every setting. Some pairs of children seem to work very well together, and there are exceptional volunteers who wish to and are able to work with more than one child at a time. Moreover, the children who are more able to work in groups are those who are approximately at grade level or above. They are far more able to share an adult, just because their needs do not seem to be overwhelming. The inability of most study-center children to share and to function in a group setting was an obvious shock to many people working in centers.

It is more possible to have groups for homework help, particularly if the children are working on the same assignment. The need to learn to relate to other children and to work successfully in a group is so obvious that sponsors are always tempted to try group work before they are ready for it, or have workable plans for doing so.

One kind of group work that has been successful for high school and college students is the offering of enrichment activities to groups of children. In these programs, the volunteers meet beforehand and plan the morning or afternoon program around a theme. Committees are formed to take care of arts and crafts, music, story telling or reading, and refreshments. The volunteers come as a group, and so do the children. There is no evidence of close personal relationships, and if the same volunteers do not attend every week, the program still goes on. It seems unfortunate that so many groups selected tutoring programs as the only alternative, instead of exploring what they might better be able to offer.

The typical tutoring project or study center opens in the fall, after school begins. It is usually set up with expectations of continuing at least through the academic year. At Christmas time, the project is usually shut down for the holiday, and has to be put together again in January. Some do not recover quickly, and take at least a month to get started again. Then, if there is a holiday at Easter time, the project shuts down again. Many end early in the spring, usually claiming that the children lose interest when actually, the volunteers are dropping out. The sheer mechanics of setting up projects after each disruption takes a considerable amount of time, and it is difficult for projects to plan their time commitments and schedules. To make programs work in the inner-city it is necessary to have realistic time tables. High school and college students seem to have particular trouble making long-range plans. A ten or twelve week commitment would be realistic for many student groups, and might forestall the unplanned leaving of a larger number of volunteers.

Most study centers operate for four days per week. Study center staff found that Friday was a day on which not as many children attended an afternoon program. The children did not usually have homework on the weekends. In evening programs, Friday was the least popular evening for volunteers. The pattern of Monday through Thursday became quite standard in study centers. At the housing project, the school social center was especially active on Wednesdays, so the afternoon program took place on the other days, including Friday. Although the children were not as apt to have homework assignments, they attended in just as large numbers on Fridays, and it was a good day for activities. Where the only available activity was homework, Friday was not considered a satisfactory day.

At all the centers, the staff became aware of how much more difficult the children became as the week progressed. There was a recognizable tension before Friday. This became much worse before holidays. The week before Christmas and the weeks before the ending of the school year are especially difficult. Public school teachers are also aware of this problem, but usually explained the reason as the "excitement of the children because they are looking forward to vacation." Generally, there is little discussion of this issue in the educational literature and in the preparation of teachers.

The most extreme reaction reported from the centers was at the housing project during the last week of the special summer school. North Park avoided much of this trouble by remaining open almost continually. The children seem so obviously anxious that it is impossible to dismiss their concern as "excitement." Even while they talk of sleeping late and watching television all day, the tone of voice does not sound happy. They are increasingly restless and inattentive and much more prone to minor squabbles.

The staff could identify some of the children who reacted most strongly to the coming holidays as those who were more often in the streets, and perhaps more vulnerable to trouble there. Week-ends are a time when the children more often lose track of time, and Saturday morning programs have to begin late in the morning.

At Welles-Darrow the last week of a six week special summer school was difficult for two summers. The third summer, the staff was so aware of the problem that they made special efforts. Many volunteers had been involved in former summer programs, so they wanted to know how to make it less difficult. Extra activities were planned in every class. If two projects for a craft class were planned, the volunteers in charge were asked to add at least one more project. No one expected to solve the problem, but only hoped to keep the children so busy that there would be less tension and disruption. The staff was pleased and surprised when the final week passed without any of the arguments, tears or extreme restlessness that they had anticipated. Both volunteers and the coordinator were convinced that the efforts made to offer more activities and more choice than usual was responsible for their success.

The children always claim that the last few weeks of regular school are spent in "finishing up" workbooks and that they do much less work near the end of the year. A morning may be spent checking-in books. If the approach to holidays is really as difficult and anxiety-provoking to these children as it appears to be, this problem ought to concern the schools, and perhaps greater efforts made to offer meaningful work or activities particularly during the last week. It is also obviously a tragedy for these children that so many agencies operate by "office hours" and are not available when they most need them. Week-ends seem frightening to them, because they lose the structure they have known during the week, but few agencies offer any week-end activity. Many operate from nine to five on weekdays. In the evenings, the children who attend the storefront center at North Park are in the streets when not at the center--there is no other place for them to be. On the weekends, they are also in the street.

Materials

The centers cooperating with the demonstration project had a variety of materials available. These included a supply of pencils, theme paper for school assignments, crayons and "scratch" paper, such as paper that was mimeographed on one side. They all had donated magazines and books, encyclopedias and dictionaries. Sets of standard vocabularies such as the Dolch cards and phrases, arithmetic flash-cards and various phonics, reading and arithmetic games and work books were kept in a supply cupboard, which was in some centers locked.

Volunteers often started out using sets of programmed materials, because they were labelled by grade level and appeared easy to manage. Their size, in small single-story sheets, made them more appealing to the children than long books. Study centers need such materials in part because they are attractive to youngsters. But their potential was found to be limited since their segmented character limited effective learning and failed to develop sustained interest.

A variety of school readers always had to be available, because the children often looked for something familiar. Even the format was familiar to them, so that they often selected that type of book, even though they were different from those they had used in school. The centers each solicited or bought some of the materials listed for reluctant readers, such as controlled vocabulary series. Again, volunteers liked these because the reading level was clearly indicated.

The new readers, which were not yet available in the public schools, were very successfully used. The Detroit readers were the first, but when the Bank Street Readers became available, every center managed to secure some and both children and volunteers reacted very favorably to them. When the children borrowed them to take home and to school, several teachers sent notes back with children asking where they had obtained the books. With several older children, and especially those who required extensive review, the Structural Reading series was used. The books were used successfully by a number of volunteers but they all had a good deal of supervision.

A supply of phonics and arithmetic workbooks were often at first welcomed by the children, partly because they were familiar. In fact, the children often explained to volunteers what was wanted in the exercises. Some would seem to hide behind such familiar materials, and many showed that they were aware of the responses wanted. They could work mechanically, without really having to think about what they were doing, or understand it.

Gradually, paper back books became one of the most appealing materials for the children. They often commented that they were "little" books and they liked their small size. Paperbacks were considered "real" books, in contrast to the controlled vocabulary series which were thought to be special devices for backward students. The children often preferred to take a regular library book without a picture on the cover, explaining that it was a "real" book, and they seemed to prefer to struggle with harder books than to accept what was obviously especially packaged for poor readers.

All the centers found it useful and in fact necessary to supplement their library with new materials. At the storefront center, neighborhood residents began to come by during the first week. This pattern continued. They brought paper, pencils, books and magazines as donations. In the housing project, the CHA staff was very responsive to requests, but again, volunteers brought many materials. At both centers, parents several times sent a dollar bill folded up with the registration form, explaining that they knew the center used many donations, and they would like to help. In one case, the staff was concerned because one of the poorest families brought in a donation of $5, but the obvious pride of the family seemed more important than the fact that they could ill afford such a contribution.

At North Park, the children wrote thank you notes for the donations, and this was a welcome assignment for them. At the housing project, it was handled by the staff. Sometimes, the coordinator sent a note, and often the children wrote such letters individually or collectively.

The efforts of the volunteers to have the children bring homework from school were not generally successful, until the children knew them quite well. While good volunteers could and did simply ask what kind of work they were doing in school, and make up appropriate materials, the majority never developed this ability. They depended on the materials and suggestions of the center staff.

Coordinators had expected volunteers to assume more responsibility for materials. Gradually, they all admitted that this seemed unrealistic. Volunteers considered their time at the center as their contribution, and few brought materials with them. The exception was in the college tutoring project, where there was a pattern of developing original stories, letters and games for the children.

While a variety of materials seemed helpful and necessary because of the needs of both volunteers and children, the actual materials seemed very secondary to the ability of the volunteers to use them. For a completely uninterested child, a volunteer selected an issue of Life magazine with an exciting space venture recorded in pictures. The child was not really interested at all, and the volunteer felt let down. But in looking at the magazine, the little girl noticed the American flag on a spaceship and very excitedly said "that's Mr. Kennedy's flag." She seemed unaware that it was also her flag and that of her country. She was interested in looking at a large map of the U.S.A., which had been on the wall for weeks, but had not seemed appealing. The rest of the evening was spent with the map, with the child full of questions. Which states were first? Where were all the states she had heard of?

In each center, most youngsters developed a positive interest in one or more subjects or topics. But there were a minority, two or three out of fifty, for whom interests or ideas that "appealed" could not be found. Nearly all volunteers needed suggestions, materials available, and lots of encouragement to develop these interests in their youngsters. A few volunteers who could not make use of available ideas were themselves too disinterested. One of them, a college senior, was himself so tired of school, so unhappy about his need to pretend interest in studies, that he could not be interested or interest a student in anything. When asked about his college paper, he said "I have no interest in it, why should he?" Daily newspapers were rejected by him, for the same reasons. But because he was intelligent, he finally realized that he was the basis of the problem--not the child. Children have an uncanny way of sensing sincerity, and that is the main reason why projects must be very willing to accept a wide range of approaches and materials.

Many volunteers and students feel most comfortable with what they recognize as regular school materials. Others want only different, new ideas at first. Most end up using both. Only those very few volunteers who lack real interest themselves end up with feeling and statements that "nothing works," because they themselves lack the interest to offer anything with sincere expectations of success.

The lack of materials was considered by some sponsoring agencies to be one of the major needs. In part, from the experience of this demonstration project, this does not seem to be the case. This would seem to be more a lack of knowledge about the available resources. It was not necessary for the research staff to provide much material to projects with which it cooperated. The agency or board in charge found publishers and groups such as college women's boards very willing to help. Some publishers gave materials so freely at first that they later had to decide criteria for selecting projects to help, and they sometimes asked groups to not publicize their donations. However, securing materials was not a problem for the groups in the demonstration project and for groups which had good organization and adequate leadership. Of course, many groups in the inner-city had to buy expensive sets of materials which were then inadequately used, because of the instability of the projects.

In any planning discussions of a new center, at least one professional would present the idea that only new materials must be offered to these children because "they are so tired of old things." This was sometimes a teacher, other times a social worker, but always a professional. The non-professional and the volunteer never made such a statement. They seemed generally more aware of how under-equipped the public schools are and how great was the need of the children.

When middle-class families want an encyclopedia, they may buy a new one, or they may look at the want-ads for a recent one. Those lower-class families whom we found who had such materials had paid the full price for them, and felt under pressure whenever a salesman came by to tell them that the one they had was not the best. When the children in several centers talked about books and how much they cost, a majority of them thought children's books cost "about $5." It was reminiscent of what their parents thought about the cost of college. It was something they hoped for, but not seriously, because they only knew that it costs "thousands of dollars." When they heard of the limited cost of local colleges, they found it hard to believe. The same was true of books for children.

The centers undertook circulation of paperbacks although this was thought to be dificult to manage. This was done successfully, by providing sandwich bags for the children to carry them in. At one center when books were bought at book sales, the staff busily erased the price marks until one day a volunteer suggested that they be left in. The children were very impressed that good books in good condition were available for 10 or 25 cents. They had never heard of such a thing. Some parents asked about second-hand bookstores, and were especially surprised to find that paperbacks, which they read, were also available there. They often came then with questions about encyclopedias and had to be assured that it was very nice for a family to have one, but that they should not feel under pressure to buy more because of a salesman. The staff pointed out that they did not have a variety of such materials in their homes--and that both libraries and study centers had several different ones for children to use.

In conclusion, it should be pointed out that supervisors also need an opportunity for mutual assistance and continued development. The project conducted two city-wide conferences with selected supervisors. In the long run, this activity needs to be located in a group such as the Mayor's Commission on Human Relations or the Volunteer Bureau of the Metropolitan Welfare Council.

CHAPTER IX

ORGANIZATIONAL PROBLEMS: COMMUNITY RELATIONS

The after school study center serves as a link between the families of the neighborhood and the public school. In this chapter the experiences of parent involvement are reported, including the parents and childrens' contact and images of the public school teachers and school administrators. In a real sense, one of the most important functions of the after school center staff is to speak to the school on behalf of youngsters and parents. These parents were found to be excluded from school contacts to a degree that was difficult to comprehend.

It was in the second year of the demonstration project that the principal investigator was invited to a public school in a neighboring city to meet with teachers and parents. She was told that they had a program of parent participation and they were having regular meetings. She would meet with the teachers before school started early in the morning, and then with the parents sometime later. The following is an excerpt from her field notes about this experience:

> I was very interested in seeing how the school had developed a program and how it operated, so I agreed to go. I did not realize how extremely naive I was until I got there. The meeting with the teachers went very well, since they were a captive audience and this meeting was considered part of their regular

> work. They were more critical of tutoring and after school study centers than most groups of teachers with whom I met. However, they did make several comments about how helpful it would be to them to have such a program. I thought the hostility might have resulted from their having been a captive audience; this group of teachers had been required to meet with me at eight o'clock in the morning. Ordinarily, such meetings that I have attended have been open to those who volunteered, and so probably attracted more people who were sympathetic.
>
> There was time to tour the school and then I reported to the room where the parents meeting was held. Although I had met quite a number of staff members by then, no one had mentioned to me that the parents' meetings were in fact "a complete flop." It was only after I got to the room and waited with the professional teacher in charge of "parent involvement" that I realized that only one mother and one grandmother were going to appear. When the teacher left the room for a while, I asked them how many ordinarily appeared and they told me they had been the only ones at every meeting. This teacher did apologize for this and said that it seemed to be very difficult to get the parents out in this neighborhood and suggested that we just have a casual discussion.

Such audiences are by no means rare. On another occasion, the principal investigator was asked to come to a library during "National Library Week" to discuss with parents how the library can help their children.

> This meeting was set up months in advance and the day before the meeting, I was called again to make sure that the arrangements still stood. I arrived shortly before the meeting was to begin and found the library completely empty, except for staff. I wondered if I had been mistaken in the date and finally someone went to look for the head librarian. She assured me that it was the right night and that it was a few minutes early. She showed me where the meeting would be held and then I asked if I could look at some books. I went off to one section of the library and returned at the time the meeting was supposed to begin. I was in a very large room with at least one hundred chairs arranged in straight lines and a beautiful display on the walls and the only people there to admire it were the head librarian and myself. She

> explained to me that she had just taken the job and therefore did not feel responsible for this mistake. In fact, the previous librarian was not responsible either because these meetings were required by the library board.
>
> In a few minutes, one woman arrived and said that she had actually come only because she wanted to meet me because she had read about one of my publications. We sat and chatted for a while. The woman was an ardent library user and was concerned that the library was hardly being used by anyone. The librarian asked us both for suggestions about what she could do.
>
> Just as we walked out the door together, the one visitor offered me a ride home, and the librarian asked her if she had seen my book Helping Hands. She said no and that she would like to. The librarian, therefore, opened a small office and said 'I keep some of the controversial books here in my private office and people have to ask for them.' She brought out a copy of my book from what apparently was this category (since it dealt with volunteers) and gave it to the woman to check out.

The principal investigator, over a six year period, had encountered frequent community and parent involvement meetings sponsored by schools and libraries which failed to produce much of a response. Experiences with community based programs were more often successful. Two or three people interested in starting a volunteer educational project would talk with friends and then would ask if they could bring their friends along so that they could all participate in the discussion. A group which started out to be two or three would ordinarily end up being at least six people. The examples of the meetings that completely failed were in large bureaucracies, such as the school and the library, while study centers and tutoring projects are not bureaucratized to the point where they cannot admit when something is an obvious flop and cancel a meeting which will have no relevance except to be recorded in an official report.

Parent Involvement

As one goal for study centers, our orientation materials listed "to develop approaches for reaching the families of the youngsters who are being served." Some early projects which were not part of the demonstration effort tried in various ways to "force" participation by parents. Some had discussion groups for parents, to which they had to come if they wished their children to participate. From the beginning, we rejected this prison philosophy but realized the importance of helping families to support both the work of the study center and of the schools.

Both local and national materials prepared about tutoring projects have talked about parent involvement mainly in terms of the need to have a "parent advisory board." Not a single one of the successful projects that we observed in Chicago ever had an effective "parent advisory board." The research project did work closely with parents' block groups in setting up the study center at the public housing site, and met with these groups twice a year afterwards to discuss programs with them.

Parent involvement starts with the basic obligation of tutoring projects or study centers to secure the parent's permission in writing for the children to participate in the program, or in special events and trips. This was done in the four centers with which the research project cooperated, but it is often not assumed by many sponsoring agencies as their responsibility. It would seem an obvious first way of respecting the legal rights of parents—and their moral responsibility for their children's welfare.

In addition, except for STEP, the centers did assume responsibility for informing parents about the progress, or lack of it, of their children. Again, this should be assumed a basic responsibility but is often not mentioned as a first step in parent involvement.

The extreme position of claiming that "nothing can be done for a child unless the family is involved "is contradicted by the tradition of years of experience of teachers, religious leaders and neighbors who have helped children with or without their parent's help, and sometimes despite the parents' initial unwillingness to support the child.

Despite the widespread assumption that lower-class parents are hostile to the schools, our experience was that they were much less verbal in criticizing schools and teachers than so-called "middle-class" parents. They are fully aware of how dependent on the schools their children are and as their children start out for school they are deeply concerned. They know very well that education is essential for their children to be successful in life. Since school is known to them to be the only hope for their children, the parental groups we dealt with did not believe in attacking the only hope they thought they had. They are not prepared to assist, however, and often become indifferent as the school fails their children.

"Middle class" parents often make disparaging remarks about their schools and teachers. These same people have read books about why parents should not fight in front of children, but many have never realized that their attacks on their school are as damaging to their children. While they would not consider telling their pediatrician how to take care of their sick child, they often have no hesitation in telling the schools and teachers how to educate their children. This was not the case in our contacts with "inner-city" parents.

We were convinced that the best way to reach a parent was to help his child. If successful, the parents would accept and support what we were doing. They had a right to know what the program sought to accomplish. Centers had an obligation to tell parents that this work was only supplementary, and could not take the place of work in school. Such terms as "remedial reading" were never used. The emphasis, on forms given to parents, was on "extra individual help so that the child's schoolwork can improve."

It is particularly important to evaluate each type of family contact. STEP reported a very large percentage of "occasional" contacts with parents. Actually, the content of these contacts was found to be almost completely in telephone calls made because the attendance of children was irregular. Another reason for lack of contacts with parents was that the college tutors usually met their students at the center, before going on outings, and returned them there. The other groups never used the study centers as a meeting place for outings but required volunteers to call for children at their homes and return them there at a time known to the parents.

Next to STEP, the South Shore center reported the least contact with parents. This was partly due to the location on the second floor of the local "Y" building, on a commercial street. Both children and volunteers lived within a few blocks radius, but came by appointment. Ordinarily, parents only called for an appointment if they were concerned enough to want to talk to the staff. Parents were encouraged to come to register their children, but many did not. The staff felt that the parents' responsibility was to see that their children attended, and that they had no right to expect more from them. In addition, the South Shore center was located in a middle-class community, where many of the staff had personal and professional contacts with the schools. Problems such as concern with eyesight, and the need for referral to other services or agencies, were referred back to the schools, with success. Although North Park and Welles-Darrow worked as closely with the schools as they could, the same problems more often resulted in the study center staff feeling that they had to become involved, and even find facilities for the children, because of the absence of adequate channels in the inner-city.

The types of behavior problems were different at the various centers and thus produced different types of parental involvement. Since South Shore was the most formal, it was not equipped to handle difficult children. While all the study centers agreed that severe behavior problems were not appropriate candidates for tutoring, the sheer access to both North Park and Welles-Darrow meant that the limits of acceptable behavior were very much broader. The clientele of South Shore was obviously, visibly different, because they were individual children who came only by formal appointment for individual tutoring. Both North Park and Welles-Darrow had children who sometimes came as members of groups, or with friends to visit or to do homework, and then were often only slowly able to accept individual help.

Unlike South Shore, both North Park and Welles-Darrow were located within residential buildings. Both centers had the children's families living next door, and children who knew that the staff could easily meet their parents, and who immediately either asked that their mothers come by the center or that the volunteers or coordinator "come meet my mother." During the summer particularly, at both study centers, children walked around the community with their classes or volunteers, and met members of the family on the street. At Welles-Darrow the first day the center opened, a summer school group went out searching for leaves, and met one of the mothers who had been a Girl Scout leader, and who was most helpful with suggestions. The first day that North Park opened, children in one large family were given individual appointments for one evening a week, went home, and immediately came back with a note from their mother. They "have no place to sit to do their homework--could they please come every night just for that?" A note was sent home saying that, of course, they could. From the minute they opened, both centers were a part of the neighborhood, simply by being there. Both were very interested in reaching the families, but there was little in the experience of volunteer groups to guide their efforts. But because both staffs were sincerely interested in supporting both the schools and the homes, they gradually developed meaningful relations with the families served.

One immediate problem that staff became aware of in contacts with parents was the unwillingness of some children to take home books or materials. The public school discouraged such practice and the children complained that they had no safe place to keep them. After some children expressed no interest in books for a long time, the volunteers found that they were really afraid to take them home, for fear something would happen to them.

In the housing project center, this problem was mentioned at each parent's meeting at the beginning of a new year. They were told that the library was available and that it was hoped that the children would use it freely. They could help by finding a place for each child to keep his books and papers, so that he could be responsible for them. We knew from experience that some children would otherwise feel reluctant to use the library. At the storefront center, this suggestion was sometimes made to parents individually.

Children later mentioned the places their mothers found for them, such as a high cupboard shelf or a dresser drawer. The idea of having such a place seemed new to many children, and they would often mention what they were going to put with "their private papers."

The staff afterwards doubted that any other suggestion of theirs had meant as much to the parents and children. Volunteer staffs could anticipate this problem in inner-city neighborhoods, because it is apparently a constant concern for the children. Papers and books are mislaid, younger children destroy them, or they are thrown out because no one realizes that the child wants to save them.

Among the projects that the children make for themselves, a simple shelf to go over their bed was perhaps the most popular. The girls especially liked to cover boxes with contact paper to be used for private treasures, and would come back to the center to report that everyone in the family wanted one and they wanted to make more.

The privacy of tutoring sessions was obviously important to the children. Often, they jealously guarded against intrusion of others into "my lesson." Volunteers who were unaware of their feelings sometimes found that an outing was spoiled for the child because the volunteer thoughtlessly invited siblings or friends to share the trip. "Sharing" was an obvious problem for the children, and the volunteers usually became aware of how much the individual contact meant to children who had to share so much all the time. Even the physical setting emphasized the privacy of tutoring to the children, and they were quick to assert their rights. A table at which they sat with a volunteer was "our table" or "my table" and they returned to the same place week after week. If someone else happened to be sitting there, the child would wait patiently, or more often during the first weeks, demand "my table."

The housing project, with its six attractive rooms on two floors, was enjoyed physically. Even if the group were small and worked together, children would often walk through the extra rooms, seeming to enjoy the luxury of walking through rooms and closing doors. No matter how small the group, some would ask to go upstairs and work in pairs of two or three. "Playing school" was a favorite activity after homework was finished, and small groups would go upstairs to play, closing the door. Two children who had the same assignment would ask during homework time to go upstairs and work alone. A box of dress-up clothes used for drama groups was used nearly every day by a small group of girls, who would go upstairs and shut themselves into a room. Nearly every day, the six rooms were used most of the time, because the children seemed to enjoy the availability of privacy. Sometimes, children expressed the same need by asking if they could move to a corner, or to the other end of the room.

At the storefront center, there was only a small backroom available, which was usually used by children who wanted to do homework and who were not being tutored that evening. If available, one or two children would move there with their tutors at the children's request.

Despite the apparent wish for privacy of groups or pairs, the children never asked to work alone in a room. This was suggested for individual projects a few times, where the child needed a lot of space. They preferred a table at the end of the room. The staff could not remember a single child ever physically isolating himself from the rest, and the children are seldom seen alone. They came to the center, worked, played and participated in pairs or threes. At the homework center, these units were of friends; at the storefront, they were of siblings. When one child missed attending the center, the other one or two were not apt to be there, and in remembering the children, the volunteers and staff realized that they remembered them often as part of a pair or a small group. It was hard to picture some children without the best friend or sister who was always there.

North Park

The main contact with parents came because the coordinator and some volunteers lived in the immediate neighborhood within a few blocks of the center. They saw the children on the streets, and they themselves were often on the streets and known to the residents. The study center remained open during Christmas vacation except for one week, during which time a party was held for the children. The staff brought records, and the children danced. Some children complained that they were the "squarest records" they ever heard, and they ran home and brought back their own pop tune records. After this experience, the children were always asked to bring records.

This study center remained open through all of the spring vacation, and closed only for national holidays. This helped to avoid the disruption at most centers, in starting over again after holidays, and it was obviously the time when the children needed the center the most, since they were at very loose ends during any vacation time. Sometimes special programs could also be planned for legal holidays, but if not, the center was closed for that one day.

Contacts with parents during the first year were individual, and mostly the result of telephone calls or personal calls on families if children did not attend regularly. The coordinator together with a student "helper" preferred to go to the home, instead of telephoning, to see if the parents and child were interested in continuing at the center. In time, the volunteers also discovered that it was productive to do home visits instead of telephone calls. Most of the children who were regularly late or failed to show up were children from homes without phones. These seemed to be the poorest and most disorganized families. Eight of fifty homes did not have phones, and these children were consistently the ones who took the longest to learn to keep appointments.

The staff felt that the families appreciated their concern, and they more often found out reasons for the children not attending. Even the excuse that they "forgot" had a different meaning in some cases. For example, in one case the mother came home from work late, and had to prepare dinner for a very large family. Several of her children had appointments on different evenings. She was very sincere in wanting them to attend, had asked them to remind her, and was quick to blame herself for not always remembering. When a staff member acknowledged that it must be very difficult, and that it was unfortunate that they could not all attend on the same evening, the mother hesitantly asked for help. Together, they made a list of the appointments and at the mother's suggestion, placed it prominently in the kitchen. Thus, they solved a problem that would have been more difficult to handle by phone.

Within the first two months volunteers had made individual trips with their children, meeting them in the homes and in this way, meeting the parents. Because this study center closed only at the end of the summer for two weeks, there was no other major disruption in tutoring. Before the study center reopened each fall, the co-ordinator called on the families to re-register the children. This gave her an opportunity to see those parents whom she did not know. Weekends were the best time for these visits. Families with a phone were contacted for an appointment; others received a note that the coordinator would come by at a specific time.

The staff often discussed their wish to offer more to the families of the children, and have more contact with them. An "open house" held during the first two months of the center's operation had brought many community people, but few parents. In the spring, the study center was offered a free production of "Puss in Boots" by a volunteer theatrical group, which helped to arrange rental of an auditorium in the same building as the study center. After the play, the study center was open for the families to visit. Despite the fact that it was a children's play, most mothers came with their study center children and smaller children. Refreshments were served in the study center, and more than half the families were represented.

A short time later, the staff was offered a free production of "Through the Looking Glass" by a professional group, with only two days' notice. The owner of the bar across the street, who had supported the center with funds and equipment, offered the second floor of his building, free. The staff was concerned that there would not be time to notify the families, but the children took over this job. The response was excellent. All of the children and most of the volunteers attended. Almost every family was represented by at least an older sibling and a large number of fathers came. In contrast to the children's play, everyone was very dressed up for this evening at the theatre. The production, without scenery, was an ideal choice for a family party. The play could be understood on many different levels; it was sophisticated, yet familiar. Afterwards, there was a great deal of discussion among the children that they had expected to see curtains and properties on the stage. Some had not seen a professional production before and had thought that scenery and curtains were essential. They talked as if they had seen something very new and amazing. Since the entertainment was held outside of the study center, there was no discussion of its education work--no "strings" were attached. While many might not consider such an event as "parent participation," so far as the staff was concerned, it was a most rewarding evening for all three--volunteers, children and their families.

During the first year, the contacts with parents were quite limited to situations that arose in the study center. These contacts involved children who had a problem other than a disciplinary one. Discipline at the study center was considered to be a staff responsibility, not to be imposed on the parents. Most common was concern with the need for glasses. The school was asked first about the suspected need and usually, but not always, was aware of it. They had encouraged the parents to get glasses. The concern of a volunteer or the coordinator was enough to cause the parents to do what they had simply put off doing. Some had unrealistic ideas about the cost, and it was helpful to make referrals for them. Of a dozen children only one accepted a volunteer's offer to escort the child for an examination. This was a family where the mother was dead and the father worked long hours. He was most willing to take care of the problem, but needed help in escorting the child.

During the second year, both parents of children in the study center and parents who lived near began to call or come by with questions. This happened about twice a week, and the staff felt some concern that they could easily become a referral agency, but the amount of such inquiries remained steady during the next several years. It seems obvious that the center will remain a place to turn to with educational problems, unless the schools develop a different image. One concern was children being assigned to EMH rooms. (These are rooms for Educable Mentally Handicapped children.) Three parents came independently to the center to ask what it means that their children were "going to be kicked out." The use of EMH rooms was explained to them, and they were encouraged to talk to the school about their concerns, but it was doubtful if any did.

Each year, an open house was held for parents at the study center. The children read poems, and some read original writings. Approximately three fourths of the families came each time.

For many parents, North Park was the only agency available to their children. As a result of contacts with North Park, some parents have been able to begin to use other agencies in the neighborhood. It is difficult for middle class people to understand how unavailable a facility is to lower class children because it is even three blocks away, or across a dangerous street. Two agencies which had activities for children were not originally seen by the parents as available for this reason. One, six blocks away, was simply out of bounds because of the neighborhood through which the children had to walk to get there. Another, three blocks away, was available only to older children since their parents believed they could safely go there. A branch public library two blocks away was in a gloomy location and considered out of bounds for most children. Two years later, when the area was properly lighted, this facility became available to more children. But the geographical constriction of the lives of lower-class children is a continual shock to middle-class volunteers. Small children are confined to their homes or the street in front of their apartment building after school. Pre-adolescent and even adolescent children are often confined to their city block. This does not mean that there are not some children who are quite free-wheeling and who travel freely about the city, but these youngsters are a minority even in the population of the North Park study center. This storefront center was within walking distance of Old Town, the lake, and a zoo. Most children went to these places with their volunteers, for the first time. The "loop" was a favorite excursion and many children claimed never to have been there before.

One problem which did not occur at this storefront was the use of the center as a baby-sitting service. This had happened in middle-class neighborhoods, but the difference seems to be in the concept of what baby-sitting is. The children in the storefront neighborhood were on the streets for hours unsupervised. When a family did have a teen-ager to care for the children, her job seemed limited to serving food at mealtime.

Parents of the North Park storefront center children did not seem concerned about the safety of their children, in contrast to the Welles-Darrow housing project parents who wanted their children escorted home after dark. During the first three years of the North

Park center's operation, the staff had to continually encourage even small children to go home at nine o'clock at night, when the center closed. They would begin to play in the street, and it was not unusual for an eight year old boy to be the oldest in a group walking home several blocks at night. This changed after the riots in the spring of 1968, and parents began to escort their children. The children were no longer always in the street. The street in which the study center is located was subjected to discriminate damage, with some stores broken into and others simply having the windows marked up. The study center was not hit. However, demolition of unsound buildings is going on near the center and the neighborhood gradually being invaded by groups of young men from a nearby housing project. Although these changes had been going on for some time, it was only after riots nearby that parents became concerned about the safety of their children. Where previously only one family had insisted on having an adult escort the children, after the riots nearly all children were escorted to and from the center by adults.

Welles-Darrow

Meetings with parents were held at the beginning of each new semester at the Welles-Darrow homework center, and at graduation at the end of summer school. At registration time, the parents sat in one room, and the children in another with some of the staff. Although not required, since the children were registered in advance and parents had already signed a form registering them, the turn-out was very good. Most children had some adult come on registration night. There were only two or three fathers, and some mothers explained that they could not stay long but the children had insisted that they come. At "graduation" at the end of the summer program, every child had someone from his family present. This might be an older brother or sister, but in all but a few cases, the mothers came. Many more fathers came to this affair, representing about a third of the families.

At the first meeting, the parents were told of the schedule and volunteers were introduced. An effort was made to tell them as much as possible about what their children would be doing. They were encouraged to visit, and to call the center if they had any questions. The first summer, no one came to visit and only a couple of calls came when children were ill. This increased slowly during the next semester. More parents called. One said, "you always called me when he was absent, so I thought you'd like me to call." She sounded very hesitant, as if fearful that this gesture would be rebuffed. They gradually accepted the fact that the center did appreciate such calls, and it became very unusual for a child to miss and for the family not to let the center know.

Besides introducing the volunteers to parents, and telling them of center activities since the last previous meeting, the effort was made to explain the success in terms of the cooperation of school, home and study center. Each one had responsibilities, and that of parents primarily involved seeing that their children attended school regularly, and that they had adequate opportunity to do their homework.

The group meetings were always very short, and few parents said anything. There were always positive comments, but only once did a parent express concern about the program. She wanted to know if her child could be assigned to all academic classes, and no crafts or other activities. The coordinator went over the schedule with her, and she seemed satisfied when she found that the program was heavily academic. It was after the group meetings that the main contact came between staff and parents. Individually, the parents seemed to feel much more free to ask a variety of questions, often about their children in the program but also about other children at home. The staff came away from these meetings feeling that nearly every parent in the room wanted some kind of assurance about her children, or some factual information about the availability of school programs of which they had heard, but about which they seemed fearful to approach the schools.

The testing was explained to the parents, and they were offered the test results for their children. This was the only center in which tests were showed to most of the parents, who, because of the offer at the registration meeting, called later and asked for an appointment. Besides showing them the test, there was always an explanation of what the scores meant, and what the child had been told.

While the coordinators at all four centers knew the children, at Welles-Darrow and North Park the staff also knew the parents. Partly because of the parent meetings at Welles-Darrow, the coordinator saw the parents much more often. There was also an obvious difference in the way that information was communicated in the community. The housing project was a more isolated community, and a great deal of information was passed by word of mouth. Parents very often referred to the experience of another parent, when they called. This was never true at North Park. The parents themselves had to decide that the center was available, without knowing of others' experiences. After a few mothers at Welles came to learn about their child's reading scores, the rest seemed immediately aware that this was possible, and began to call for appointments.

The children in the housing project were often very aware of activities in other homes nearby. They were much more apt to know who had skipped school, who got a beating last night, and whose mother was called to school. The actual number of contacts with families was not a lot greater than at North Park, but included more families. The contacts were more diffuse and included at least a nominal contact, through discussion of the test results, with nearly every mother. The number of one-parent homes was very similar in the two settings, but the staff was more aware of the efforts of the mothers in the housing project, who seemed very open about seeking help. They were, of course, usually mothers of more capable youngsters, who no doubt contributed greatly to the fact that their children did achieve. The fact that they were more interested in opportunities for their children, more concerned about their high school placement and availability of special program and opportunities should have been expected.

The children seemed very aware of the close relationship between home and the study center. When a volunteer became angry with a child one day and threatened to call his mother, he startled her by saying, "Go ahead. You talked to her all the time anyway."